THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

Dr. John Baillie's new book, *The Belief in Progress*,[1] should on no account be missed. The title would not at first sight appear to suggest that a heartening and inspiring call to Christian service was being provided, but it is to this that Dr. Baillie summons us, after cogently expressing his reasons why such a summons is extremely well founded in the world in which we live to-day. Dr. Baillie has now become Principal of New College, Edinburgh, and in addition he has been elected Dean of the Faculty of Theology in Edinburgh University. His world-wide reputation in theological circles always ensures for his writings a wide and discerning public. Let it be said that once again he lives up to that high reputation he has gained, and that he has provided us with a volume which well repays, as it demands, close attention.

Just thirty years ago, in 1920, Dean Inge delivered his famous Romanes Lecture on 'The Idea of Progress' and now Dr. Baillie feels it to be laid on him to return to the same theme. It would appear that a world war brings into sharper focus a question that is ever with us, and concerning which it is important for us to be clear in our minds as to what the Christian point of view should be.

Has our belief in progress been completely mistaken? Or is there definite progress to record in the realm of knowledge and scientific achievement, with no corresponding progress to record in the realm of human behaviour? Is there any clear purpose in life, and if so to what is it leading? Is there a final culmination of all things, and of what nature is it likely to be? These are all questions that are distinctly relevant to our age, and there is very deeply involved in the answer to them the future of the Christian religion. It is obvious that two things are necessary—first, the intelligent interpretation of history, and secondly, a clear understanding of what the Christian Faith has to say.

Dr. Baillie provides, first of all, an exceedingly useful and comprehensive study of the history of the idea of progress, and of the various 'Patterns of Progress' that have been traced out during the centuries. Then, in his third chapter, he comes to the pattern providing 'the working faith of recent Western Civilization.' 'So far as it may be considered to be false, the doctrine of progress is a Christian heresy . . . It is the development of one aspect of the received truth to the neglect of other aspects.' How this pattern came to be worked out he describes in graphic and arresting fashion, paying special tribute to Bury, whose 'Idea of Progress' (1920) he commends for its admirable survey from the seventeenth century onwards. Although the note throughout was one of secular optimism, Dr. Baillie remarks that the prevailing tendency in Britain was to regard the belief in earthly progress not as an alternative to the traditional Christian outlook but as a supplement to it. Later, and particularly in the nineteenth century, under the influence of Hegel and Comte and Herbert Spencer, the traditional Christian position was ignored and the idea of the omnicompetence of the human reason in every department of life became firmly established. Now that this kind of belief in inevitable and automatic progress has been sadly shattered by the course of events, the time is opportune for the kind of study that Dr. Baillie offers when he asks whether we have any real ground for the assertion of any *a priori* principle which would lead us to look for spiritual progress in the past, or expect it in the future. He further asks whether such a belief in progress, even if substantiated, could really provide the spiritual satisfaction that men have sought. His discussion at this part leads to the conclusion that the *a priori* presupposition, the element of faith, which was the specific foundation of seventeenth and eighteenth century belief in progress, is no longer available to us.

In the most rewarding part of his book he comes to the question whether there is in original Christianity the hope that during the interim period, the years of grace falling between the inauguration of the Christian era and the end of earthly history, human life and society will be more and more conformed to the mind of Christ. Having shown that all forms of progressivism have harboured a debt,

[1] Oxford University Press; 10s. 6d. net.

often acknowledged, to the Christian hope, he proceeds to show how that hope is still our only ground for a true and worthy belief in progress to-day.

At this point he takes up modern New Testament teaching, and reviews in masterly fashion the conception of the Kingdom of God, referring of course to Schweitzer and to the impetus given by him towards deeper study of what Christ's teaching really was, gradually working through to C. H. Dodd's 'realized eschatology.' He goes on to point out that there are two vitally constituent elements of the New Testament outlook that seem to be given less than their due weight. One is the cosmic aspect of the Christian hope; the other is the sense of a victory already accomplished, and of powers of the Spirit already available to us. In connexion with the first he calls attention to Cullmann, whose works are surely overdue translation into English, and emphasizes Cullmann's point that there is often a considerable interval between the decisive battle during a war, and the celebration of 'Victory Day.' He also draws attention to the well known article in the International Review of Missions by the late D. S. Cairns in which Cairns defended the certain assurance of victory against the contrary view that human history will be 'a ding-dong battle all the way with the good becoming better and the bad worse till the end comes.' The fact that, on Dodd's view, the Kingdom of God is already here must not be allowed to militate against our conviction that there will still be a time of final consummation.

His conclusion then is that the Christian Faith does offer us a very confident hope for the future course of terrestrial history. 'It is a hope that has been too little represented in the Christian tradition, but to which we are now recalled. We must recover that sense of standing on the threshold of a new historical dispensation, that sense of a noble prospect opening out before us, that sense of the power of the Spirit and of the inexhaustible resources now available to us, that adventurous zeal for the renewal of humanity and that confidence in ultimate victory of which the New Testament is so full. We must allow that one cause of the emergence of the secularized and distorted version of the Christian hope, which it has been our present concern to study and to refute, has been the felt need of compensating for the apparent defeatism that characterized so much of traditional Christian thought.' The balance must be redressed in such a way that it is at once more consonant with original Christianity and less vulnerable to legitimate and fair-minded attack.

Having thus cleared the ground he goes on to make a most effective plea for the continuance of Christian propaganda as providing the only means whereby true progress can be assured and as guaranteeing the only victory that is likely to be lasting and real.

The Rev. Leslie S. R. Badham, M.A., H.C.F., has written a useful, popular contribution to the Christian 'apology' under the title, *Verdict on Jesus*.[1] It claims to be 'a fresh inquiry' into the grounds of the Christian faith; and its style is simple, clear, and pointed. Here, in illustration, is a sentence chosen at random in which the Dominican and the Franciscan friars are compared: 'These two orders were largely complementary in their activities—the one characterized by high thinking, the other by kindly living; the one remembering the breadth of the Master's mind, the other the largeness of his heart.'

The first half of the book, the 'thesis,' is an appeal to the facts of history, with the intention of showing how incomparably great and valuable the influence of Jesus has been. It is a useful conspectus of Church history with Jesus always in the central position. It might be described as a new edition of 'Gesta Christi.' Among the facts on which it insists is the many-sided impact that Jesus has made on human life and culture, on art, music, literature, and law, not to speak of morality or of religion. In this section, as indeed throughout the book, the author quotes often from the works of recent authoritative writers.

The second section, the 'antithesis,' treats of 'the advance through storm' (Latourette), or, in other words, of the progress of the Christian cause despite opposition and criticism. It is the shortest of the three parts; and perhaps it is well, as the author is happier in the building up of his case than in his discussion of the 'centuries of crimson malice and grey negligence.' For instance, his treatment of the recent much-canvassed books of Loisy and E. W. Barnes on the origins of Christianity is somewhat cavalier. It is surely insufficient to remark that their books have 'little more than an antiquarian interest' at the present hour. They may be out of fashion, but that in itself is no evidence of their falsity.

In the third part, the 'synthesis,' the author has before him the question: What is that 'something' in Jesus that has brought about His unique influence in the world, and has enabled His cause to survive opposition and negation? For Mr.

[1] Williams and Norgate; 9s. 6d. net.

BADHAM is persuaded that Christianity is on the march again and that it is once more intellectually respectable to be a Christian. What then of Jesus ? Is He an accident or a revelation ?

Beginning with the observation that modern physicists, like the Greek thinkers, speak of a Mind behind the universe, our author goes on to urge that the supreme Mind must surely reveal itself where there are creatures capable of receiving the revelation. Indeed there is nothing philosophically difficult, it is further urged, in believing that the Creator God should out of love for mankind send to the world an ambassador or mediator—a Messiah, a Son of God Incarnate.

On the assumption that God might thus choose to make Himself known through a personal human life what are the conditions, Mr. BADHAM asks, that might reasonably be postulated as to be fulfilled before the advent of the Messiah, before the incarnation of the Son of God ? The answer here given is : (1) We would expect God to prepare men's minds by raising them to a level at which the teaching of the Messiah would be intelligible. (2) We would expect God to give mankind some ideas by which they could, if they were true to the best insight that they had received, recognize the Messiah when they saw Him. (3) We would expect God to choose an opportune time for the Messiah's birth and for the fruitful planting of His teaching. (4) And a fourth anticipation is added, with regard to the Messiah Himself. We would expect that the character of the Messiah, when He came, would be such as to commend itself to men, as fitting one who was indeed bearing a message of august and sublime significance.

These four logical anticipations are discovered to have been wholly fulfilled in the first century of our era (though to describe the ' discovery ' as ' amazing ' savours of exaggeration), as witness the four succeeding chapters of the book, entitled The Significance of the Old Testament, The Atmosphere of Expectation, Flood-Tide, and The Clear Mirror.

In the concluding chapters Mr. BADHAM treats of the seeming finality of the teaching and life of Jesus, as offering the purest idea of God that we can receive, and the highest pattern of virtue that we can envisage ; and of Jesus' own testimony to Himself, which is consistent with the impression of transcendent mystery that has been made by Him all down the centuries. The framework of thought in which the New Testament enshrines the transcendent mystery (Messiah, Son of God, etc.) may not be the framework of *our* thought, but we should use it till we find a better.

The Dead Sea Scrolls: Publications and Review.

BY THE REVEREND BLEDDYN J. ROBERTS, M.A., B.D., BANGOR.

THE American Schools of Oriental Research and the Hebrew University of Jerusalem have each published recently extremely important works containing facsimiles and transcriptions of parts of the Hebrew manuscripts now apparently officially designated ' The Dead Sea Scrolls.' The former is the first of two volumes entitled *The Dead Sea Scrolls of St. Mark's Monastery*, and contains the whole of the Isaiah manuscript and the Habakkuk commentary, under the general editorship of Professor Millar Burrows, with the assistance of Dr. J. C. Trevor, who first photographed the manuscripts, and Professor W. H. Brownlee, who has already published a translation of the Habakkuk commentary. The work is exquisitely published, and, in addition to the facsimiles and transcripts, has a foreword by Mar Athanasius Yeshue Samuel, Syrian Archbishop-Metropolitan of Jerusalem and Hashemite Jordan, to whom the work is dedicated, and some brief introductory remarks by the editors, giving an outline of the story of the discovery in 1947, and details of measurements of the Scrolls. For convenience, I reproduce the general scheme of nomenclature and sigla as it is given in the introductory remarks, because it is likely to be commonly used in future : DS = The Dead Sea Scrolls ; DSD = The Sectarian Manual of Discipline ; DSH = The Habakkuk Commentary ; DSIa = The St. Mark's Isaiah Manuscript ; DSIb = The Hebrew University Isaiah Manuscript ; DSL = The Aramaic Lamech Apocalypse [1] ; DST = The Thanksgiving Psalms ; DSW = The War of the Sons of Light with the Sons of Darkness. Further fragments, which provide the

[1] In the Spring 1950 number of *Archæology* (a publication of the Archæological Institute of America) an announcement is embodied which was made by the Harvard University concerning the condition of this Scroll—also known as the Fourth (unrolled) Scroll, part of which has been identified as the Lamech Apocalypse.

textual student of the Hebrew Bible with extremely important evidence, are designated DSf, with an indication of the book to which the fragment belongs, thus, DSfGen (*i.e.* Genesis) or with a number if the fragment is non-Biblical. Unfortunately, the texts of fragments which Dr. Lankester Harding brought to the British Museum in August 1949 have turned out to be too small for identification, many of them are no larger than a finger-nail and contain but a letter or two. At best their use will be confined to palæography.

In the *ASOR* volume, the whole text of the Scroll DSIa is reproduced on fifty-four plates of practically the same size as the original manuscript, and a printed Hebrew transcript is given on the opposite pages with the chapter and verse enumeration of the present Massoretic text. DSH follows on eleven plates, with a transcript which shows the quotations from Habakkuk in thick type.

The contribution of the Hebrew University is made in the second volume of Professor E. L. Sukenik's *Megillôth Genuzôth*,[1] and is a book of some ninety pages written in Hebrew. It is of somewhat larger size than *Megillôth Genuzôth*, i, and the two volumes, published by the Bailik Foundation, demonstrate the very high quality of Israel's scholarly publications, and one cannot but admire the impression which the new State leaves on the world of scholarship. Professor Sukenik discusses in the present volume various aspects of the discovery, and though there may be disappointment that the text of DSIb, which is in Jerusalem, is not more fully exhibited and discussed, facsimiles of the other Scrolls and their treatment combine to make the volume extremely valuable. In the introductory remarks, the author gives additional details about the way he acquired the manuscripts, and adds a useful table of the various scripts used in the Scrolls.[2] He then discusses some texts, provided with facsimiles. They include portions of DSD, DST (three songs), DSW, DSfLev (in archaic script),[3] DSIa (with copies of facsimiles),[4] with a table showing comparative readings in the Scroll and the Massoretic text, DSH, and, finally, the very important DSIb, with a facsimile, transcript, and notes of two adjacent columns, containing the text of 48^{17}–49^{7}. The publication of this text confirms the statement already well-publicized in the press, that DSIb is virtually the same as the Massoretic text, the major difference consisting of *scriptio plena* and *defectiva* divergences. Parts of this Scroll were exhibited earlier this year in the British Museum, and the portion then shown is of special interest because it contains a textual variant from M.T., namely that in 53^{11} where the Scroll gives 'he shall see light,' a reading to be found also in DSIa and in the Septuagint, and previously advocated by numerous commentators.[5]

One other important contribution published recently, which provides first-hand information about the discovery, and facsimiles of passages from additional fragments from the cave, is the article by Father R. de Vaux of Jerusalem entitled 'La grotte des manuscrits hébreux.'[6] The article is in two parts; first, the ceramics of the cave are described, with arguments intended to prove 'without doubt' that the jars which held the manuscripts were definitely of the late Hellenistic period, that is, of the second century B.C. Secondly, a series of fragments are given in facsimile and discussed. They consist of the following sections: a few words from each of the following passages from the Book of Leviticus, 19^{31-34} 20^{20-23} 21^{24}–22^{3} 22^{4-5}, all in archaic Hebrew script; a portion of the Book of Jubilees in Hebrew; a fragment of eleven lines of an unknown text. The Leviticus text (DSfLev) shows the same affinity with the M.T. as that found in DSIb, but it should be noted that the actual amount of text extant in the fragments is too small to allow any definite verdict. Father de Vaux would date these fragments as early as the fourth century B.C., and he thinks that they formed part of a Scroll of Lv 17–26, the Code of Holiness, which may, at that time, have been in circulation as a separate code. But, as Professor Sukenik reminds us in his treatment of these

In the announcement the Chief of Technical Research in the Fogg Museum states that at one end of the Scroll 'four or five layers of outer leather have been cracked off and lost and here are revealed light cream-coloured inner layers, . . . and these may be of parchment.' He further remarks that they may turn out to be two separate Scrolls, one leather and one parchment; and that, though it is known that the outer, leather Scroll has writing, it is not yet established whether or not the parchment is inscribed. The difficulties of unrolling are, it is feared, insurmountable, and the officer suggests that 'the unrolling of the middle may perhaps be done only at the sacrifice of the ends, especially if it is certain that there is no inscription here. It is hoped that that will not be the case.'

[1] Cf. the present writer's 'Recent Discoveries of Hebrew Manuscripts,' in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lx., 305 [August 1949], to which the present remarks form something of a sequel.

[2] A comparison of this table with a similar one by Dr. J. C. Trever, in *BASOR*, cxiii. [February, 1949], 20 f. is instructive.

[3] These are also discussed by Father de Vaux, and will be mentioned later in this résumé.

[4] These are copies of facsimiles previously published in *BA* and *BASOR*.

[5] Cf. *Biblia Hebraica*[3], *ad loc.*

[6] *Revue Biblique*, LVI. iv. [October, 1949], 586 ff.

fragments, there are Mishnaic references to the custom of writing the Torah in the archaic script at a very much later period, even after the fall of Jerusalem.[1]

As in the former discussion, I find it convenient to deal with the Scrolls and their significance from two standpoints—firstly, their relevance to the textual history of the Old Testament, particularly of the Book of Isaiah, and, secondly, their possible contribution to the study of Jewish history. The remainder of this review will deal with these.

Among the Biblical texts, the most important are DSIa and b; at the same time, they are the most difficult to place in any pattern. The major difficulty, quite apart, I think, from the question of dating, lies in the fact that two such dissimilar text-forms of Isaiah belong to the same cache, and therefore, presumably, to the same sect. DSIb is very similar to the M.T.; DSIa is comparatively dissimilar, for the publication of the entire text has shown that the divergences between them are by no means confined to orthography and occasional variants. The present writer has felt for some time that too much was made, in the earlier stages of the discussion of this Scroll, of the similarity and even identity of the text with that of the Massoretes, and elsewhere [2] he has presented some considerations for its being regarded as a recension text. The publication of the whole Scroll has not in any way modified this view, nor are there *prima facie* grounds for denying its likelihood. The variants are almost always typical of recensional divergences; they may be paralleled in the Septuagint recensions, or, again, in the relationship of such renderings as the Targums and the Samaritan Pentateuch to the Massoretic text, or even of the parent texts of the Vulgate and Peshitta to it. Now the history of the transmission of the Hebrew Bible itself provides evidence of Scribal activity in the treatment of such textual variants. In the Jerusalem Talmud Taanith iv. 2, and repeated elsewhere, it is said that there existed in the Jerusalem temple, therefore, at latest during the first century A.D., three 'copies' of the Torah, with the following divergent readings: in Dt 33^{27}, one offered the reading *ma'ôn*, two *ma'ônah*; in Ex 24^{5}, one had *za'ṭûṭê*, whereas two had *na'ar*; one had *hi'* nine times, the others eleven. In every case the Scribes favoured the reading of the two 'copies' rather than the one. Until recently it was thought that this Rabbinic story simply described an eclectic activity by the Scribes, who acted commendably in choosing the reading of two manuscripts against the one; but since the discovery of the Old Cairo Genizah manuscripts, it has been realized that a variant reading in an ancient manuscript generally indicates much more than a mere scribal error or idiosyncrasy. It far more frequently represents a die-hard remnant of a traditional variant text-form, transmitted in the text by ever-meticulous scribes. It is submitted, then, that the Scroll DSIa is a copy of such a recension text, and its existence suggests either a sect which did not subscribe to the authority of those Scribes who, in due course, produced the Massoretic text, or a period before the exercise of Scribal establishment of the text, or, again, both these alternatives. Naturally, the publication of the whole of the Scroll does introduce certain considerations which will demand further study respecting this 'recension' theory. For instance, a very obvious feature of the Scroll is the division of the text into paragraphs. In most cases the division coincides with that of the M.T., but not invariably. Furthermore, as far as can be established, there is no such thing as a strictly uniform text-division even in the transmission of the M.T. itself. Thus, a comparison of *Biblia Hebraica*[3] with, say, Ginsburg's edition, shows minor divergences; and an examination of Old Cairo Genizah fragments of Isaiah reveals a similar absence of uniformity. On the other hand, it is natural to expect a measure of agreement, especially in scrolls designed, as this was, for public reading at a time when the need for Targum renderings was generally recognized.

The problem becomes more involved when we consider the presence of DSIb in the cache. The palæography shows, according to Professor Sukenik in *Megillôth Genuzôth*, ii, that the Scroll belongs to the same period as the other Scrolls. The discovery of other fragments, including books from the Torah and from the Kethubim and beyond, with an orthography of the same class, indicates that in the original deposit there was at least one copy of the text according to this recension. The presence of other books, such as Jubilees, the Lamech Apocalypse (possibly from a recension of the Book of Enoch?) shows, however, that the present limits of the Hebrew canon of the Old Testament had not been defined at the time. Consequently, we must accept the conclusion that two recensions were used by the sect, and that probably one of them was more standard than the other; and, because DSIb is practically that of the M.T., and because the text of the other Biblical books belongs to the same recension, it is reasonable to assume that this was the more official text-form. Now, if the Biblical Scrolls in the cache belong to the pre-Christian period, as archæologists and most palæographers still insist, there is evidence here that the authority of the

[1] Cf. Mishnah Yadaim, 4^{5}, and the comment thereto in Professor Danby's translation.

[2] In an article scheduled to appear in the forthcoming *Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft.*

Massoretic text was established long before the period generally assigned to it, namely, the second century A.D. On the other hand, the evidence for associating this authorization of the M.T. with the early second century A.D. is traditional and very strong—so strong that for centuries scholars were misguided into believing that a *Musterkodex* was formed at that time which was subsequently scrupulously followed by the Massoretes. If this tradition is historical, a reasonable *terminus a quo* for the Dead Sea Scrolls would be the first century A.D. Professor Kahle has suggested [1] that the occasion for hiding the Scrolls in the cave was the attempt by orthodox Judaism, about the end of the first century A.D., to annihilate all sectarian literature and textual recensions divergent from the more or less standardized M.T.; but the presence of DSIb and the other fragments in the cache would seem to contradict this view. Nevertheless, it is difficult to explain why DSIa was not cancelled in view of the actual acceptance of DSIb and the other (assumed) Biblical Scrolls.

By way of a general observation on the significance of the Isaiah Scrolls for the textual study of the Hebrew O.T. generally, it may be remarked that any hope of evidence for textual emendation must be deferred until a more adequate understanding of recensional readings has been achieved. Fundamental issues are raised by the existence now of three divergent and possibly contemporary text-forms of Isaiah, namely DSIa, DSIb (=M.T.), and the parent text of the Septuagint. What is a recension text? Is it a later divergence of an original archetype? Or is it a perpetuation of a very ancient text-form? Professor Paul Kahle and others have been greatly exercised about the application of these two possible reconstructions to the early history of the Versions, and they have concluded in favour of the latter alternative. It may be that their arguments have been considerably strengthened in principle by the present discovery. In any case, it is incorrect to assume that, for instance, because DSIa or the LXX gives a reading which differs from the M.T., and is also more acceptable to a commentator, the commentator is justified, on purely textual grounds, in emending the M.T. accordingly.

By the publication of DSH Professor W. H. Brownlee has rendered a two-fold service. Firstly, he has made available the text of chs 1 and 2 of the Prophecy of Habakkuk as used by the sect which originally preserved the Scrolls, and secondly, we may know from its contents what the sect made of the prophecy in their exegesis. Textually, the Scroll differs from the M.T. in a number of details, and the suggestion lies to hand that again we have a recension text of the same type as DSIa. But an important consideration is mentioned by Professor Brownlee in his introductory remarks, namely, that the text presupposed by the commentary sometimes differs from that of the quotations themselves, and agrees with the M.T. Possibly, then, this again is a case of duplication of texts. Further study may enable scholars to resolve this enigma.

Secondly, the substance of the commentary comes for brief consideration. In the words of Professor Brownlee, the commentator 'wished to show how the national and religious situation of his day had been foretold by the prophet Habakkuk.' The major interest attaches to two anonymous personalities, the Righteous Teacher and his opponent, the Wicked Priest. Nowhere is the question of dating the whole corpus of manuscripts more relevant than in the attempt to place these figures in an appropriate historical setting. To say that these personalities frequently recur in the Scrolls is simply to underline this importance.

By an amazing coincidence, there have lain in the University Library of Cambridge since the beginning of this century three manuscripts from the Old Cairo Genizah, which belong to the tenth and twelfth centuries A.D., now called the Damascus Document [2] and which likewise deal with the Righteous Teacher and the Wicked Priest. Scholars have failed to agree on the date of the original composition of these manuscripts, but the general view which obtains is that they belong to a sect which flourished about the end of the pre-Christian era, and which was later banished from Palestine and re-formed in Syria, whence its title, 'The Damascus Covenanters.' In a recent estimate of the date of the sect, Professor H. H. Rowley [3] states that he 'would prefer not to attempt a closer definition of its age than to say it fell somewhere in the last century and a half before the Christian era.' Despite the daring of the statement made by Professor Millar Burrows in the work referred to above, that 'the internal evidence of the Scrolls themselves shows that they were the work of the same Jewish sect of the New Covenant which, perhaps at a later point in its history, produced the "Zadokite" Damascus Document,' nothing has as yet appeared to challenge it, and naturally, the contents of the

[1] *Theol. Lit. Zeit.* [1949], 2, col. 91 ff.

[2] They were first edited (as two manuscripts) by S. Schechter, *Documents of Jewish Sectaries*, vol. i., *Fragments of a Zadokite Work* [Cambridge, 1910], but subsequent work on the text has enhanced its value, and at present the best available sources are the Hebrew edition by L. Rost, *Die Damaskusschrift*, in Lietzmann's *Kleine Texte*, No. 167 [Berlin, 1933], and the translation by R. H. Charles, *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha*, ii. [1913], 785–834.

[3] *The Relevance of Apocalyptic* [1944], 71–4.

Damascus Document will now receive an additional significance.

The most important of the hitherto published works which consider the Scrolls in their relationship to the Damascus Document is an article by Dr. Bo Reicke of Palestine, entitled ' Die Ta'amire-Schriften und die Damaskus-Fragmente.' [1] Dr. Reicke had earlier discussed the Damascus Document in relation to the New Testament,[2] and had dated them in the Hasmonean period at the latest, mainly on the grounds of anti-Hellenistic tendencies in the contents, and of stylistic contacts with the Book of Jubilees. In the present article he fastens on the identity of function in DS and the Damascus Document of the Righteous Teacher and of his opponents, and he also develops his historical analysis in a very interesting way. It is particularly important, argues Reicke, that in the DS Scrolls the opponents of the sect are called Kitt'im ; they are mentioned nine times in DSH, and here the word obviously means Greeks or Hellenists, especially in the light of the formulæ Kitt'iiê Assur and Kitt'iiê Misraim as found in DSW, where they betoken the Seleucids and Ptolemys. Even before the discovery of the Scrolls, maintains Reicke, it was held that the Damascus Document contains a reference to Antiochus Epiphanes, the ' head ' of the kings of Jawan (Greece). But now, continues Reicke, a still closer identification can be assumed, namely that the villain of the piece, the Wicked Priest, was none other than Joseph, son of Tobias, who collected taxes for the Ptolemys *c.* 200 B.C., and who is known to us from Josephus' *Antiquities*, XII. iv. 5. The main clue to the identity is that a certain kind of incestuous marriage which Joseph had made is specifically prohibited both in the Damascus Document and in DSH. There are, indeed, striking coincidences in this and other items in the case made by Reicke to establish the identity. Nevertheless, it appears to be premature to draw any definite conclusions of this kind, especially as it might involve closing one's mind to other possibilities before the whole of the texts has been published. Thus, Dr. Reicke has found the evidence in the DS Scrolls to support his particular interpretation of the Damascus Document ; but one wonders whether, for instance, Dr. J. Schusboe, who identifies the Righteous Teacher of the Damascus Document with John the Baptist,[3] will likewise come across some interesting possibilities of identification ! Still more serious is the fact that numerous outstanding Hebraists have from time to time argued strongly that the Damascus Document is considerably later than even the first century A.D. I think particularly of the case made by G. Hölscher [4] who cannot see any compelling reasons for an early dating, and concludes that it is a matter for Jewish mediæval students to establish the date of the sect. Obviously the question of the relationship of the DS Scrolls and the Damascus Document should be thoroughly examined, but, because the latter is very much the smaller text, it will best be studied in the light of the larger collection.

[1] *Studia Theologica*, ii. [Lund, 1949], 45–70.

[2] *The Jewish Damascus Document and the New Testament* [1946].

[3] *La Secte Juive de l'Alliance Nouvelle au pays de Damas et le Christianisme Naissant* [Copenhagen, 1942].

[4] ' Alter und Herkunft der sogen.-Damaskusschrift,' in *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xxviii. [1929], 21–46.

Literature.

OLD TESTAMENT CRITICISM.

At no time during this century has it been so difficult to write a critical introduction to the Old Testament. A generation ago it was customary to speak of ' the assured results ' of criticism. Those ' assured results ' were many, and they extended even to details. To-day, they are fewer than was once assumed, and that there are any ' assured results ' at all would be widely challenged. Just what the challenges are is for most people a matter of hearsay and surmise, but they are sufficiently bruited about to occasion widespread alarm and despondency.

Where does criticism stand to-day ? No better answer to the question can be given than in a little book by Professor H. H. Rowley, under the title *The Growth of the Old Testament* (Hutchinson ; 7s. 6d. net). Dr. Rowley does not conceive it to be his task to concentrate on an exposition of the recent rival views, though he knows very well what they are, and naturally he has something to say about them. Nor is it his aim to present his own views, ' but to acquaint the reader with the present position of Old Testament scholarship . . . yet not in so bewildering a way that it will leave him with no clear ideas. His emphasis will therefore be on the consensus of opinion among sober scholars, though he will not present it as the assured and unchallengeable view of modern scholarship as a whole.'

Here, then, is ' critical orthodoxy,' but not

critical orthodoxy which, like the older traditional theory, has to be defended at all costs, or its difficulties resolved by special pleading. 'It is wiser to recognize that, like all scientific theories, they (*i.e.*, the modern theories) only hold the field until more satisfactory theories are forthcoming, and that from the ferment of recent challenge something more satisfactory may yet emerge, though in few cases does it seem yet to have done so.' With regard to the Pentateuch, which once more is the storm-centre of controversy, Dr. Rowley shows that there is now a considerable variety of view. The Graf-Wellhausen view is widely rejected. 'But there is no view to put in its place that would not be more widely and emphatically rejected. Few of the rival views have won any adherents at all, while the Graf-Wellhausen view has still a respectable following. Before it can be discarded a view as complete and thorough-going, taking account of all the facts and related to the history, will have to be provided. A mere concentration on the acknowledged difficulties of the Graf-Wellhausen view, and then on a selection of points that may seem to support a rival view, will not do. For none of the rival views can accommodate so many of the facts, or can escape far more difficulties than the view it seeks to replace. Yet having said this, it remains true that the Graf-Wellhausen view is only a working hypothesis, which can be abandoned with alacrity when a more satisfying view is found, but which cannot with profit be abandoned until then.'

There is a 'maistrie' about this small and inexpensive book which could only come from a scholar who knows all that has been, and is being, said about the subject. Dr. Rowley is a kind of central telephone exchange for all that relates to the Old Testament. His sanity of judgment is everywhere acknowledged. And he is not to be panicked. The advanced student and the beginner alike must read this book.

C. R. North.

ST. AUGUSTINE.

The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C., is in process of producing a notable series of volumes under the general title 'Ancient Christian Writers.' More than one hundred volumes are projected and ten volumes have already appeared. The latest to appear contains two works by Augustine, *The Greatness of the Soul* and *The Teacher* (Newman Press, Westminster, Maryland; $3.00). These two works have been introduced, translated, and annotated by Joseph M. Colleran, C.S.S.R., Ph.D.

These are two of the most interesting of the shorter works of Augustine. *The Greatness of the Soul* sets out to answer six questions—Where does the soul come from?, What sort of thing is it?, How great is it?, Why was it united with the body?, What results from its union with the body?, What results from its separation? Clearly in such questions Augustine has room to move amidst the great things of the faith.

The Teacher consists of a dialogue between Augustine and his sixteen year old son Adeodatus. It probably took place the year before the death of Adeodatus and may well have been put together as a tribute and memorial to him. It is doubly interesting from the fact that 'all the thoughts expressed in the person of the one discussing with me are his own, although he was only sixteen years of age. . . . The talent he showed filled me with awe.' It is really a discussion on the use and purpose of words. Adeodatus begins with the assumption that when we use words we wish to teach others. Soon the argument proves that words are only signs. The argument goes on to show that a word is not really a sign but only a sound if the hearer does not already know the reality for which the sign stands. The inevitable conclusion is therefore that truth does not come from any external teaching, but from within the soul, and that therefore the only real teacher is none other than the illumination of God, or Christ within us. There is obvious influence here from Plato's 'Meno' but Augustine, with all the subtle dialectical skill of which he was a master, develops this thesis in a way that makes it his own.

Both works are in dialogue form, the first with a character called Evodius, and the second, as we have said, with Adeodatus. As in all classical dialogues the sympathies of the reader inevitably go to the helpless victim who is lured on to his own logical destruction and who has no more hope of escaping from the bands that logic is weaving round him than a fly from a spider's web. With wary caution Evodius remarks, 'I understand what you are saying, but not yet perhaps, what you are after.' And—surely in exasperation—he breaks out, 'I wish you would not ask me about what cannot happen.' But there is a naturalness about the dialogue with Adeodatus which is altogether unusual and altogether refreshing.

Dr. Colleran has provided adequate introductions to both dialogues. In both cases the analysis of the contents is specially helpful. The translation is as good as could be expected because of all Greek forms the dialogue is the hardest to translate with any vivacity. There are really excellent indices by which any reference can be found without trouble. The notes are rather slight.

This is a series which has begun well and which will be a very valuable possession when it is completed. It is worth noting that very

considerable discounts are offered to those who become subscribers to the whole series.

WILLIAM BARCLAY.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE REFORMED CHURCH.

The publication in complete English dress, after almost ninety years, of Dr. Heinrich Heppe of Marburg's source-book, *Reformed Dogmatics*, marks the achievement of a notable enterprise on the part of the translator and the publishers alike. Here is how the title page runs : Heinrich Heppe, Reformed Dogmatics, Set out and illustrated from the Sources, Foreword by Karl Barth, Revised and edited by Ernst Bizer, English translation by G. T. Thomson, M.A.(Oxon), B.D., D.D.(Edin.), S.T.P., University of Edinburgh (Allen and Unwin ; 50s. net).

A recent translator of Homer has said that there are three prerequisites for a good translation : the translator must know his own language ; he must fall in love with his work ; and he must understand the language of the original. Professor Thomson appears to possess all three. There is nothing like long training and experience in ancient and modern languages, such as he has had, to enable one to master one's own language. His zealous devotion to the study of the traditional doctrine of the Reformed Church is well known, particularly among those who have been his students whether in Aberdeen or in Edinburgh. As for the language of the original (in this case chiefly two languages, Latin and German) one has only to recall his success in wrestling with Barth's Prolegomena to be assured of his adequacy to the task he has now fulfilled.

In the Foreword (which appears to offer some recalcitrances even to the work of a skilled and experienced translator) Barth recalls his own indebtedness to Heppe, whose book—unattractive as it was in its original dress—along with the parallel Lutheran work of H. Schmid served to unite him again with the ancient creeds and the mediæval theology from which he thought himself to have been severed by the theologies dominated by Schleiermacher and Ritschl. That was in 1924, when he found himself faced for the first time with the task of teaching Dogmatics. He regards Heppe as more truly informative on the Calvinistic tradition than the more gifted and more highly equipped Alexander Schweizer of Zürich, a disciple of Schleiermacher's.

Barth's Foreword was written for Bizer's edition of 1935. But it was in 1861 that Heppe's book first appeared : *Die Dogmatik der evangelisch-reformierten Kirche*. It was composed, as the late Professor William Hastie has remarked, in the mild and conciliatory spirit of Melanchthon, and with an erudition and industry not unworthy of Melanchthon himself. But through his careful and painstaking work of revision Bizer has succeeded in making many corrections in Heppe's citations ; and he has also presented the book in much more attractive form.

Bizer makes no change in Heppe's arrangement of the book : first, the exposition of each ' locus ' or head of doctrine as a whole (in German) ; then the supporting citations (mainly in Latin), often with footnotes (also mainly in Latin) in small type. On the other hand, Professor Thomson makes very pronounced changes. Not only is each section of the exposition followed immediately by the citation or citations, but the footnotes when they occur are incorporated with the citations. Many of the Scripture passages also to which reference is made are translated. And the type is uniform throughout. The result is a much larger book than in the German editions, and one more difficult for the ordinary reader to use ; for he will not readily distinguish in every case between the section of the exposition and the illustrations from the dogmaticians that follow in support of it, especially as both the exposition and the illustrations are before him in English. And, further, many a page of citations may separate him at times from the succeeding section of the exposition.

No doubt Professor Thomson thinks his arrangement better for teaching purposes, and it may well be so. Yet if I were desirous of studying or re-studying the Calvinistic doctrine, let us say, of predestination, I should prefer to begin by reading Heppe's exposition of it as a continuous whole rather than in parts widely separated by the citations. Barth appears to think that while Heppe's work provides the best introduction to Reformed Dogmatics it is not to be absolutely trusted as a source-book ; which, if true, detracts in any case in some measure from the value of the citations.

While Bizer is of opinion that Heppe's work was worthy of being revised and republished because of its faithful exposition of the orthodox system of doctrine in the Reformed Church, he is not wholehearted in his attitude to Heppe. He allows that the lack of clarity he observes in some parts of the work is unavoidable, as it was a broad and not always plain road that led from Calvin to Keckermann and finally to Wyttenbach and Endemann. But he thinks that the old orthodoxy inherited by Heppe from the Reformed theologians was not always self-consistent in its dogmatic expositions, and tended now and then to turn a revelational into a philosophical theology. But Professor Thomson deprecates Bizer's criticism of Heppe and of the Reformed Church orthodoxy ;

and he speaks out of a long experience as a theological teacher when he affirms, characteristically, that 'to an age fed on the husks of human enlightenment and to-day craving for the true light of direct revelation Heppe is manna, and that in plenty.'

W. FULTON.

COMPARATIVE RELIGION.

Of recent books on comparative religion *The Origins and History of Religions*, by Professor John Murphy, D.D., D.Litt. (Manchester University Press; 25s. net), is one of the best. The author has a comprehensive grasp of his subject, is a master of illuminating phrase, and in the presentation of his main conclusions reaches a happy mean between necessary emphasis and unnecessary repetition. In the comparison of religions he finds the Common Feature method too superficial and the purely Historical method too narrow, the latter tending to concentrate attention, especially amongst anthropologists, too exclusively upon early origins and inducing devotion to pet theories which are strained to breaking point in the attempt to make them all-explanatory. Dr. Murphy himself prefers the Cultural Horizon method, in which the situation is allowed to speak for itself, and the persisting influences of past history are shown in close relation to the dominant characteristics which present themselves to a student of the religion as it actually exists to-day. Of these horizons he distinguishes five—the Primitive, the Animistic or Tribal, the Agricultural, the Civilized, and the Prophetic. The first three are self-explanatory. By the Civilized he means the type of religion which is marked by an increased capacity for abstract reasoning, a greater stress on ethical considerations, and the development of individuality. The Prophetic carries farther the emphasis upon individuality, and treats mainly of religions which are to a great extent dependent upon the influence of a particular founder.

The apparatus indicated is very skilfully used, and provides a framework for a most illuminating treatment of the various religions. Great stress is laid upon the primitive or *mana* religion, the attribution to any mysterious object of power, life and will, and, correspondingly, the theory that animism is the basis of all religions is rejected. The analyses of the religions of the Hebrews, of Egypt and of Greece are especially brilliant. One is conscious of being assisted to a fuller understanding of Old Testament history, Egyptian religion becomes not overwhelming but intelligible, and the interweaving of political and religious development in Greece is most suggestively indicated. In his study of Indian religious thought Dr. Murphy departs from conventional methods in his emphasis upon the importance of the Indus valley culture of 3000 to 2500 B.C., and his insistence that this should be placed alongside of the usual conception that the religious history is fully summed up as the impact of the Aryan invaders upon the primitive beliefs of the indigenous inhabitants. The chapters on Buddhism might profitably have taken fuller account of the views of such writers as Mrs. Rhys Davids, stressing the rather neglected positive element in Buddhist belief; and the data on which the estimate of Rabindranath Tagore is based might have been more comprehensive. The concluding chapters are rather of the nature of appendices and hardly enter sufficiently into the unity of a book which will be a most valuable possession for the rapidly increasing number of those who are interested in the subjects with which it deals.

W. S. URQUHART.

WILLIAM LAW.

Almost anything is to be commended that will extend the influence of William Law into another generation. The Rev. Arthur W. Hopkinson, who knows Law well, appalled by the fact for which he vouches, that 'not one person in a hundred of those who have read The Serious Call has read anything else that Law wrote,' has conceived the idea of publishing in one volume, *The Pocket William Law* (Latimer House; 6s. net), three other of his works —*Christian Perfection, An Appeal to all that Doubt*, and *The Spirit of Prayer*. Unfortunately, he has abridged them. And many things that apparently do not much appeal to Mr. Hopkinson appeal vastly to me. *Christian Perfection*, for example, is ruthlessly shorn of its inimitable 'characters,' 'portraits,' thought Gibbon, 'not unworthy the pen of La Bruyere.' Here we are granted never a glimpse of Publius and Clito; of Julius and Junius, and the rest. It seems rather a Law bereft of much of his weapons that is presented to us here. But what is given us is excellent. *An Appeal* may seem a somewhat unexpected choice out of the plethora of material available. Yet it is wise. And nowhere, surely, does Law wade deeper than in *The Spirit of Prayer*, that moving book.

But abridged editions are, to some of us, a poor second best.

A. J. GOSSIP.

The title of Bishop Gerald Kennedy's new book, *The Lion and the Lamb* (Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $2.50), indicates the character of the book. The harmony of the lion with the lamb is a paradox, and this collection of most interesting

sermons deals with the paradoxes of the Christian faith. The subject is a live one at the present time, and suggests profound theological depths, but it is dealt with here popularly rather than precisely. With our knowledge of the actualities of leonine nature we may be over-anxious lest in the golden-age zoological garden the lion should devour the lamb, but the author makes a praiseworthy and successful effort to show that, if, ceasing to be mere logicians, we try to grasp the fundamental character of Christianity, our fears will be discovered to be groundless.

Justice and the Law of Love (Allen and Unwin ; 5s. net), by Konrad Braun is the Swarthmore Lecture for 1950. In the conditions of appointment of the Lecturer it is laid down that he must choose ' some subject relating to the message and work of the Society of Friends.' The present Lecturer came into close touch with the group of Friends in Berlin before coming in 1938 to England. He is now a British subject by naturalization. His Lecture reflects a mind at once legally trained and nourished on Christian principle, and shows close acquaintance with the works of recent writers, both German and English. There is much in it that the Christian preacher should find useful. That it strikes a note often struck in recent times may be gathered from the statement that ' if love is to regenerate and inspire social, international, and inter-racial relations, justice must first promote that freedom of personality without which there can be no love.'

The Nature of the Universe, by Mr. Fred Hoyle (Blackwell ; 5s. net), is a book that will bring readers of Jeans' ' Mysterious Universe ' and Eddington's ' Expanding Universe ' up to date with the speculations and conclusions of modern physical science ; and it makes a brave attempt to attain the readable popularity of these earlier essays.

Probably the most sensational point to the theological student is the statement that the investigations of mathematical physics seem to compel the belief that the universe is being kept going by the continual creation of matter, new atoms of hydrogen constantly emerging out of nothing. Since the theological doctrine of creation out of nothing means that the world is originally and for ever dependent on Him who created it and sustains it, it is striking to have it offered as a proved scientific fact that creation is not an event in the abysmal past but something beyond scientific examination which is going on all the time.

One could wish that the author had developed the suggestion rather cryptically thrown out on one page that the tie up of time and space involved in relativity need not be absolutely true for our universe.

Methodist Worship (Epworth Press ; 8s. 6d. net), by the Rev. John Bishop, M.A., is a considerably reduced version of a thesis approved by Bristol University for the degree of Master of Arts. In its present form the thesis is a reminder of the two-fold tradition of the Methodist Church with regard to worship : liturgical and free. The first part of this book treats of the form and order of public worship in the Free Churches and considers the various elements that compose the service, the praise, prayers, lessons, sermon, and sacraments. The second part presents a detailed survey of the worship of the Methodist Church. It examines the early sources ; indicates distinctive Methodist services such as the Covenant, the Watchnight, and the Love-feast ; expounds the Methodist teaching concerning Baptism and the Lord's Supper ; and discusses the place of hymns in Methodist worship. The full title, ' Methodist Worship in relation to Free Church Worship,' suggests that Methodist worship should have been treated first and Free Church worship second, and that is what the publishers' blurb would lead us to think has been the case ! The book is well and vigorously written, and should prove of interest and use to many besides ' the people called Methodists.' Mr. Bishop is widely read in the general subject of worship.

From the Epworth Press there comes a book, the format of which does them credit—*The Cross in Poetry and Prayer*, compiled and arranged by Mr. Alexander C. Blain (5s. net). It consists of seven cycles, with seven subjects in each, all alike dealing with some aspect of the Cross. In every case there is a poem and a prayer or meditation. The selection is fairly catholic, for the net has been wide flung. The result is well suited for a bedside book, or for brief Lenten reading.

Dr. Julian Morgenstern, President-Emeritus of Hebrew Union College—he was its President from 1921–47—is one of the few Jewish Old Testament scholars whose work is familiar to Christian scholars. Since his retirement he has continued his research and writing, and has now published a volume of essays under the title *As a Mighty Stream : The Progress of Judaism through History* (Jewish Publication Society of America ; $4.00). The volume contains fourteen addresses and papers delivered during the period of the author's connexion with the College. The most valuable of them to British scholars is the first, ' The Foundations of Israel's History.' The others deal mainly

with aspects of Jewish life and thought, particularly in America, and in them he outlines his concept of and his high hopes for Reform Judaism.

Dr. Morgenstern's attitude to Old Testament criticism is frankly liberal. He accepts without qualification the general literary-critical hypothesis of the origins of the Old Testament, and even the so-called Kenite theory of the origins of Hebrew religion. Indeed, his Liberalism may almost be said to be the Liberalism of thirty years ago, little influenced by the most recent critical tendencies. The book is inclined to be wordy, which is a pity for English readers, in these days of devaluation when American books can hardly be other than expensive.

The title of the Rev. John H. Pickford's new book—*Paul's Spiritual Autobiography* (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 6s. net)—would lead one to expect a deeper psychological analysis of Paul's spiritual development, but the contents are mainly of an objective character and provide us with a simple and direct exposition of Philippians. The level of treatment is high and should help towards an intelligent and devotional reading of the Epistle. There are some fresh and convincing interpretations and the author is capable of neat antitheses. The banking analogy is rather overstressed in the concluding pages.

John Knox in Controversy, by Principal Hugh Watt (Nelson; 6s. net), contains five lectures delivered last year in Princeton Theological Seminary by the historian who is the present Moderator of the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland. The largest audiences, we are told, were attracted by the two lectures dealing with the controversy between John Knox and Mary Queen of Scots, and the reader's judgment will agree with the American popular verdict. The main contention of the book is that pugnacity and dogmatism have been over-emphasized in Knox, and attention has been concentrated on his negative criticism generally rather than upon his positive affirmation of Christian truth which did so much to build up a believing community. The Principal thinks that, as Mary owed more to the Renaissance than to the Counter-Reformation, Knox took her too seriously as a champion of Rome, but that he was right in judging that, largely on account of her impulsive political incursions—not unrelated to her religion—the future of Protestantism hung in the balance and that there was no room for compromise. Still, we are not convinced that there might not have been more courtesy and forbearance on Knox's part, or that all the faults were on Mary's side, and we seem almost to overhear the sigh of relief with which the conclusion is reached that the facts do not necessitate a defence of Mary rather than of Knox.

John Neville Figgis (S.P.C.K.; 10s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Maurice G. Tucker, M.A., is a biographical study which has been in our opinion well worth while. The name of this distinguished historian and theologian, who died in 1919 and was buried in the little cemetery of the Community at Mirfield, is now largely forgotten among us. Yet by his Hulsean Lectures on 'The Gospel and Human Needs' (1909) and his other writings he exercised a great influence upon his contemporaries, especially among the clergy. He was influential too as a preacher. He was also famous for his eccentricities, and as displaying in his person the interesting paradox of the 'ascetic gourmet'; which points have been well brought out by the biographer. But Mr. Tucker's main task, for the fulfilment of which he deserves our gratitude, has been to present us with a conspectus of Figgis's writings, to show where their indebtedness lies, and to estimate their relevance to the problems of Church and State that confront us in the present crisis. We are not inclined to quarrel with this assessment: 'It may be doubted if many in his day could rival him as a clear-sighted critic of twentieth-century civilization; in our own era Niebuhr could be compared with him, for there is the same insistence on penetrating to the moral roots of all social problems.'

The veteran American scholar, Professor Emeritus James A. Montgomery, of the University of Pennsylvania, has published a little volume of rather more than a hundred pages entitled *The Bible: The Book of God and of Man* (Ventnor Publishers, Ventnor, N.J.; $2.75). It contains seven chapters dealing with such themes as the Contents of the Bible, the Revelation of God in History, the Revelation of God in Nature, Men and Women of the Old Testament and New Testament. Professor Montgomery has many pertinent things to say, and he lays special emphasis upon the human and historical factors in the Bible, particularly upon the honourable place that women occupy in its pages. The trouble is that most of the chapters deal with the whole Bible—or at least with one of the Testaments—from the particular angle of their titles, and are thus necessarily summary. It is not easy to see for what class of reader the book is intended. The scholar does not need it, and the novice may find it too sketchy. The production of the book is not up to the usual American standards, and, high as prices are in this country, an English publisher would produce it for little more than half the price the Ventnor Publishers are asking for it.

Living Issues in Biblical Scholarship.

The Antiquity of Israelite Monotheism.

By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., The University, Manchester.

One of the living issues in Old Testament study —and they are many—is concerned with the antiquity of Israelite monotheism. The view has long been common that monotheism began with the eighth-century prophets [1] and became explicit with Deutero-Isaiah.[2] Nor is it wholly abandoned. So recently as 1947 I. G. Matthews wrote that the emphasis of Amos ' by implication paved the way for the brotherhood of man, provided a sound basis for internationalism, and was the *foundation of ethical monotheism.*' [3] This view is commonly associated with the name of Wellhausen, whose evolutionary presuppositions are widely discarded to-day, and who is held responsible for the idea that polytheism gradually evolved into monotheism through the influence of the prophets.[4] Actually it can be traced to predecessors of Wellhausen,[5] but that it long dominated much Old Testament scholarship is not to be denied.[6] Nevertheless, there were some scholars who were more cautious, and who, while recognizing development in Old Testament religion, did not ascribe it to natural evolution, but to the seed of monotheism which was implanted in Israel's religion by Moses, and which grew to its full stature under the influence of those men of God whom we know as the prophets.[7]

To-day there are various challenges to the evolutionary view which is in some quarters held to be sufficiently discredited by being associated with the name of Wellhausen. That all of Wellhausen's views can no longer be maintained is perfectly true.[8] It is equally true that no living scholar can be sure that all of his views will be maintained for three-quarters of a century. The utmost that any one can hope is that he may be

[1] A. Causse (*Les prophètes d'Israël et les religions de l'Orient* [1913], 62) attributes the beginnings of universalistic monotheism to the time of Elijah. Cf. Volz, *Mose : ein Beitrag zur Untersuchung über die Ursprünge der israelitischen Religion* [1907], 36; W. Eichrodt, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, i. [2nd ed., 1948], 106. Cf. also G. Hölscher, *Geschichte der israelitischen und jüdischen Religion* [1922], 96 f., where, however, the religion of Elijah is differentiated from monotheism in that its theoretical consequences are lacking : there is no denial of the existence of other gods, and no universalism.

[2] Cf. R. H. Pfeiffer, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, xlvi. [1927], 194 : ' We can only speak of monotheism in the Old Testament before Second Isaiah by using the word in a sense other than the belief that there is only one god.'

[3] *The Religious Pilgrimage of Israel* [1947], 129 (italics the present writer's). Cf. L. Wallis, *The Bible is Human* [1942], 166 : ' This evolutionary process . . . gradually carried the spiritual growth of the Hebrew people up to a point where the " remnant of Israel " . . . finally passed out of polytheism into ethical monotheism.' Elsewhere in the same volume, however, Wallis attributes the development to terror of the Babylonians, which was responsible for mass conversion to the views of the prophets (p. 6).

[4] M. J. Lagrange (*Études sur les religions sémitiques* [1903], 24) observes that it is ' impossible de retrouver dans l'histoire un seul cas de monothéisme issu du polythéisme.'

[5] Cf. S. A. Cook, *The 'Evolution' of Biblical Religion* (reprinted from *The Modern Churchman*, Nov. 1934), 3.

[6] Cf. W. L. Wardle, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, N.F. ii. [1925], 195 : ' It may still be regarded as the prevailing view that Israel's religion passed gradually from an elementary stage of animism, totemism, fetichism, through the stage of tribal deity, to the stage represented by the religion of the prophets, and that this stage was reached only under their influence. From this conclusion there are now signs of revolt.'

[7] Cf. E. König, *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion* [1912], 199, where the author refers to the uniqueness of the God of Moses, and adds ' Diese Einzigartigkeit Jahves schloss aber natürlich den principiellen oder potenziellen Monotheismus in sich.' Cf. P. Volz, *Mose* [1907], 65 : ' Die allgemeine Jahwereligion hat ihre Anfänge vor Mose. Die Quelle des intensiven Jahwestroms aber ist Mose.' In his *Prophetengestalten des Alten Testaments* [1938], 43, Volz goes rather farther than this, while A. B. Davidson (*The Theology of the Old Testament* [1904], 60) is more cautious. Cf. also W. L. Wardle, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, N.F. ii. [1925], 198. B. Balscheit, *Alter und Aufkommen des Monotheismus in der israelitischen Religion* [1938], also finds the seeds of monotheism to lie in Israelite Yahwism from its beginnings.

[8] S. A. Cook, *loc. cit.*, 9, observes : ' It is necessary to remember that the Wellhausen *literary* theory of J, E, D, P is not to be confused with the reconstructions of history and religion based thereon by Wellhausen himself or others. Some are conservative, others radical, and others again are by no means " evolutionary." '

enabled to make some contribution to the totality of truth. That Wellhausen was wrong in some of his presuppositions may be agreed; but that all of his views were false is a presupposition as illegitimate as any with which he started. Hence, while the present writer disagrees at many points with Wellhausen and his school, he does so with respect and remembers his debt to those with whom he disagrees. To build the tombs of the prophets of a former age and to stone contemporary prophets is a practice which stands condemned in the Gospels; to throw stones at the tombs of the scholars of a former generation is no worthier an occupation.

One of the views which has come into fashion in recent years maintains that monotheism goes back to the beginnings of the human race. This view is not new, of course. It was advanced in modern times as a scientific hypothesis by Andrew Lang.[1] It was presented by that distinguished Biblical scholar, Lagrange.[2] More particularly, however, it is associated with the name of Wilhelm Schmidt, the author of the voluminous work *Der Ursprung der Gottesidee*.[3] Schmidt seeks to establish the thesis that the more primitive a people is, the more nearly it approaches monotheism, which must therefore have been the original faith of man.[4] Polytheism is held to be the fruit of the disintegration of monotheism, and to be associated with the advance of culture.[5] Presuppositions as unwarranted as those of the evolutionary school appear to lie behind this view, which rests on a pessimistic view of human culture. To suppose that peoples whom we call 'primitive' preserve the earliest outlook of mankind is an assumption that is without foundation. Schmidt observes that these peoples 'have never played any important part in the world,'[6] and his work would seem to be directed to the establishment of the remarkable thesis that primitive monotheism was the religion of the insignificant, and that its retention entailed permanent insignificance. Moreover, such monotheism as can be ascribed to 'primitive' man by these means is an arid faith in a God whose only characteristic is His 'onliness.'[7] Religion is to be tested by the character, and not merely by the number, of the gods, and Biblical monotheism is more than the belief that God is one and beside Him is no other. Such 'primitive monotheism' as this theory sets out to prove is quite other than Biblical monotheism.[8]

In an important study the Swedish scholar H. Ringgren has shown that two opposite tendencies are found in religion, the one moving from polytheism to monotheism and the other moving from monotheism to polytheism.[9] By the hypostatization of qualities and functions a single god can disintegrate into many, while by various processes many may give place to one, the character of the consequent monotheism varying according to the process whereby it is achieved. It may advance from polytheism through a monarchic theism to monotheism, or it may take a pantheistic

[1] *The Making of Religion* [2] [1900], 173 ff.

[2] Cf. *Études sur les religions sémitiques* [1903], 70 ff., where Lagrange argues that the original Semitic religion was a monotheism in which El was worshipped, but El was subsequently split up into a multiplicity of gods (cf. p. 25). With this cf. the view of S. Langdon, published in *The Evangelical Quarterly*, April 1937, and reprinted in Sir Chas. Marston, *The Bible Comes Alive* [1937], 259 ff., in which Sumerian religion is said to have been originally monotheistic. Wardle (*loc. cit.*, 200 ff.) criticizes Lagrange, and Meek replies to Langdon's arguments in *University of Toronto Quarterly*, viii. [1939], 186 ff. (this paper appears to have been published also in *Review of Religion*, iv. [1940], 298 ff., to which the present writer has not had access). With Meek's criticisms Albright associated himself in *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 322.

[3] 9 vols. [1912–49]. A shorter work by the same author in one volume is available in English, *The Origin and Growth of Religion* [1931]. Schmidt's ideas were accepted by J. Battersby Harford in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xlviii. [1936–37], 68 ff., and by Langdon in the article referred to in the preceding note, and criticized by Meek, *loc. cit.*, 181 ff. Of the value of much of the material assembled by Schmidt there can be no doubt. That he establishes the thesis that primitive monotheism prevailed amongst men is, however, a different matter. C. Clemen (*Archiv für Religionswissenschaft*, xxviii. [1929], 290–333) criticizes his view as a fiction, and quotes (p. 333) Söderblom for the observation 'Weder "Mono" noch "Theismus" will passen.' Schmidt's view is also rejected and criticized by R. Pettazzoni, *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, lxxxviii. [1923] 211 f., 220 ff.

[4] Cf. *The Origin and Growth of Religion*, 179: 'It is just at the most primitive levels that we find the religious element still in greater purity and comparatively uncorrupted.'

[5] Cf. *ib.*, 289: 'As external civilization increased in splendour and wealth, so religion came to be expressed in forms of ever-increasing magnificence and opulence. . . . Despite the glory and wealth of the outward form, the inner kernel of religion often disappeared.'

[6] *Ib.*, 256.

[7] Vague qualities are attributed to Him, but at the best He is a shadowy Providence.

[8] Cf. S. A. Cook, *The 'Truth' of the Bible* [1938], 21: 'In the interests of progressive religion we must insist that those monotheistic or monotheizing beliefs or tendencies of which we have information are not to be mentioned in the same breath with that lofty spiritual teaching which is Israel's permanent contribution to mankind.'

[9] *Word and Wisdom* [1947].

form, or become the abstraction τὸ θεῖον. As the present writer has observed elsewhere: 'While the dogmatism that assumes a uniform linear development of religion towards monotheism is wrong, it is equally impossible to assume a development away from a primitive monotheism. The question is not to be determined either way on grounds of general principles, but on grounds of evidence, and it is doubtful whether adequate data exist to recover with security the original religion of man.' [1]

Our concern here, however, is not with primitive monotheism but with Biblical monotheism,[2] which was certainly not derived from the supposed primitive monotheism, and a much more important challenge to the view with which we started is the claim that Moses established monotheism in Israel.[3] This challenge is important because it claims no less a scholar than W. F. Albright among its champions. In his brilliant work *From the Stone Age to Christianity* he presented this view,[4] after some preliminary indications of it.[5] Nor has he been without followers. One of the reviewers of a book by the present writer said he was 'inclined to state Mosaic monotheism rather more strongly' than the writer had done.[6] Yet actually, as Meek has shown,[7] Albright only established Mosaic monotheism by giving a new connotation to the term monotheism.[8] He says: 'If the term "monotheist" means one who teaches the existence of only one God, the creator of everything, the source of justice, who is equally powerful in Egypt, in the desert, and in Palestine, who has no sexuality and no mythology, who is human in form but cannot be seen by human eye and cannot be represented in any form—then the founder of Yahwism was certainly a monotheist.' [9] Most of the elements of this definition are irrelevant to the question of monotheism, and of the one vital element in this connexion there is no evidence.[10] For nowhere in the Pentateuch is Moses credited with the formal denial that any other gods exist, such as we find in Deutero-Isaiah, save in passages that quite certainly did not issue from him.[11]

On the other hand, no evidence can be provided to show that polytheism developed into monotheism in Israel by natural evolution or by philosophic speculation. There is no evidence that Moses was a polytheist in the sense that he

[1] Cf. The Expository Times, lix. [1947–48], 194 (in a review of Ringgren's work).

[2] Cf. an important article by R. Pettazzoni, 'La formation du monothéisme,' in *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, lxxxviii. [1923] 193–229. Here it is maintained that the only genuinely monotheistic religions are Judaism, Christianity and Islam, all prophetic religions, and all deriving from Judaism, and that a true monotheism could only be achieved in opposition to polytheism. 'De même que *logiquement* le monothéisme est la négation du polythéisme, de même *historiquement* il présuppose un polythéisme dont il est sorti par négation, c'est à dire par révolution' (p. 200).

[3] J. Prado (*Sefarad*, v. [1945], 185–217) maintains that the patriarchs were monotheists.

[4] Cf. *From the Stone Age to Christianity* [1940]; 2nd ed. [1946]; German revised edition, *Von der Steinzeit zum Christentum* [1949].

[5] Cf. *Archæology of Palestine and the Bible* [1932], 163 ff.; and 'Archæology Confronts Biblical Criticism' in *The American Scholar* [Spring, 1938], 186 f. To the latter the writer has had no access, save through references in Meek's reply in *University of Toronto Quarterly*, *loc. cit.*, 192 ff. F. James, *Anglican Theological Review* xiv. [1932], 130 ff., also maintains that Moses was a monotheist. Cf. I. Engnell, *Gamla Testamentet*, i. [1945] 133.

[6] Cf. J. Bright, *Interpretation* i. [1947], 85. Cf. also G. E. Wright, *Theology To-day*, iii. [1946], 185 ff.

[7] *Loc. cit.*, 192 ff., and *Journal of Biblical Literature*, [xi.]1942], 21 ff.

[8] Meek says (*University of Toronto Quarterly*, *loc. cit.*, 194 n.): 'In answer to my request for a statement regarding his idea of early Hebrew monotheism Albright wrote, to make the whole matter crystal clear: "When the monotheistic orbit of Israel encountered the monolatrous-carpolatrous orbit of Canaan, a secondary oscillation was produced giving rise to an elliptic movement with two foci, one the original monotheistic one, the other an henotheistic one of secondary origin."' Most readers will find this a little elusive. Meek complains that Albright contradicts himself in saying (*From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 207) that Moses was not a monotheist with views specifically like those of Philo, Aqiba, St. Paul, or St. Augustine, while saying (*ib.*, 309) that he was as much a monotheist as was Hillel (*Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxi. [1942], 24 n.). Actually there is no inconsistency here. Albright surely means that while Moses believed as firmly in the 'onliness' of God as these others, he did not share their view of the nature of God. Meek (*ib.*, 24) denies that there are various kinds of monotheism, but it is hard to see how this can be maintained.

[9] *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 207. Cf. the picture of the God of Moses given by Volz, 'Der Gott des Mose,' in *Old Testament Essays* [1927], 29 ff.

[10] Cf. Meek's criticism, *loc. cit.*, 32 ff. Schmidt gives a connotation to the term monotheism from which this vital element is altogether eliminated. For he is prepared to recognize a man who believes in many gods as a monotheist, so long as he holds that One is supreme and the rest are subordinate to him (*The Origin and Growth of Religion*, 264; cf. also *Anthropos*, xvi.–xvii. [1921–22], 1022). It is hard to discuss issues when the fundamental terms are given different meanings by the parties to the discussion. For such monotheism is no monotheism.

[11] Dt $4^{35.\ 39}$ 32^{39}.

practised the worship of many gods; yet there is no evidence that he was a monotheist in the sense that he denied the existence of more than one God. Yahweh was to be the only God for Israel, and Him only were they to serve. This would seem to lead to the conclusion that he was a henotheist,[1] and it is undeniable that henotheism was found in Israel in the post-Mosaic period. Albright dismisses Jg 11^{24}, which he calls 'the parade example,'[2] on the ground that it stands in a speech addressed to an alien people and argues with them on the ground of their ideas. It is less easy to dismiss 1 S 26^{19} f.[3] Nor need we be surprised that henotheism was found in Israel. For we find ample evidence that many in Israel declined from the heights of Moses' religion and fell into polytheism.[4]

It is scarcely sufficient, however, to say that Moses was a henotheist, and this would still leave us with the problem of the transition from henotheism to monotheism. Moab and Ammon are commonly said to have been henotheistic, the one holding Chemosh to be Moab's god, and the other Milkom to be Ammon's. Actually we have no evidence that Chemosh alone was worshipped in Moab and Milkom alone in Ammon, and it may well have been that while these were held to be the national gods, others were worshipped alongside them, just as in Israel through long periods Yahweh was regarded as the national God, though other gods were popularly worshipped alongside Him. Even if Moab and Ammon were henotheistic, however, we should still have to ask how it was that Israel became monotheistic and they did not. No profound and enduring influence on the religion of mankind came through them, whereas it did through Israel.

It is on this account that it is necessary to go beneath labels in our study of Israelite monotheism, and to perceive that if Moses was less than a monotheist, he was more than a henotheist.[5] It has been said above that some older writers maintained that in the work of Moses lay the seed of monotheism. Similarly Meek says: 'It may be said with considerable assurance that Moses sowed the seeds of monotheism.'[6] It is this that the present writer would emphasize more than most writers have done, and this that offers some justification for the over-emphasis of Albright.[7] Moses did much more than lift Israel to the level that is so often ascribed to Moab and Ammon. On the human side he is the creative founder of Israel's religion, giving it a character all its own. For Israelite monotheism developed less out of the 'onliness' of Yahweh as a legitimate object of worship than out of His character. The outstanding fruit of Moses' work in this connexion is not so much that Yahweh was to be the only God for Israel as that Yahweh was unique.

There is ample evidence that behind Moses Israel was polytheistic. Her whole environment was polytheistic. Egypt and Babylon were both polytheistic, and we now know much of the pantheon of the Ras Shamra community, which provides us with our fullest insight into ancient Canaanite religion. The Ḫabiru, who were causing so much trouble in Palestine in the fourteenth century B.C., and who are identified by some with the Hebrews entering the land under Joshua,[8] were polytheistic. For we find references to 'the gods of the Ḫabiru.'[9] Many of the personal names which we find in Israel testify to the polytheistic background out of which they emerged. Alt has argued that each of the patriarchs, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, had his own special God.[10] Moreover, while in the Old Testament Shaddai, El, Elyon, and Yahweh are all equated, it is hardly to be denied that they were once regarded as separate deities.[11]

[1] Cf. Meek, *loc. cit.*, 37: 'This was henotheism and not monotheism.'

[2] *Op. cit.*, 220. [3] Cf. also 2 K 5^{17}.

[4] J. Bright suggests that the present writer holds that the religion of Moses was abandoned in Palestine. He says (*Interpretation*, i. [1947], 85): 'The Mosaic religion was debased in Palestine (the reviewer feels that the word "abandoned" is much too strong).' What the writer had said was 'even where it is held that Moses attained monotheism it is agreed that in the post-Mosaic age monotheism was abandoned by Israel, and had to be attained afresh in later days' (*The Re-discovery of the Old Testament* [1946], 78; American ed., p. 109). It was not stated that Mosaic religion was abandoned, but only that if Moses was a monotheist, his monotheism was abandoned in the debasing of his religion. For when monotheism is debased by the worship of other gods, it ceases to be monotheism, which is abandoned.

[5] Cf. F. James, *Anglican Theological Review*, xiv. [1932], 141 f.: 'the actual evidence regarding him [*i.e.*, Moses] points more towards his having been a monotheist than a henotheist.'

[6] Cf. *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxi. [1942], 37; also *University of Toronto Quarterly*, viii. [1939], 197.

[7] Cf. the writer's *Missionary Message of the Old Testament* [1945], 21 f., 27; *The Re-discovery of the Old Testament* [1946], 87 f. (American ed., 123 f.); *The Biblical Doctrine of Election* [1905], 60 f.

[8] For reasons for rejecting this view, cf. the writer's Schweich Lectures, *From Joseph to Joshua* [1950], 39 ff.

[9] Cf. A. Jirku, *Orientalistische Literaturzeitung*, xxiv. [1921], 246 f.; A. Gustavs, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, xl. [1922], 313 f.; B. Landsberger, *Kleinasiatische Forschungen*, i. [1929], 326 f.

[10] See *Der Gott der Väter* [1929].

[11] Cf. H. G. May, 'The Patriarchal Idea of God,' in *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lx. [1941], 113 ff.

The Egyptian heretic king, Ikhnaton, is often supposed to have been the source of Mosaic monotheism.[1] Even Albright has lent some countenance to this, saying, in words whose evolutionary presuppositions will not escape notice : ' A priori, we should expect that Israelite monotheism would come into existence in an age when monotheistic tendencies were evident in other parts of the ancient world, and not at a time when no such movements can be traced. Now it is precisely between 1500 and 1200 B.C., *i.e.*, in the Mosaic age, that we find the closest approach to monotheism in the ancient Gentile world before the Persian period.'[2] It is commonly held that Ikhnaton was a monotheist, because he suppressed the worship of all gods save one in Egypt. It is not certain, however, that he was a genuine monotheist in the sense of believing that only one God existed, and that therefore He was the only legitimate object of worship for all men.[3] In all true monotheism universalism is involved,[4] and there is little evidence that Ikhnaton was concerned with the world that lay beyond his empire. His religious reform is believed by some to have had a political, rather than a genuinely spiritual, basis.[5] Yet even though we allow that Ikhnaton was a monotheist, it does not follow that Moses was influenced by his ideas.[6] For if Moses took an important step on the road to monotheism, he took it along a wholly different road from that of Ikhnaton, whose religion fell far short of the significant heights reached by Moses.[7]

The religious achievement of Moses was not something that grew naturally out of his environment or circumstances, and the ideas that he mediated to Israel were not derived from Egypt or from any other people. Certainly they were not ideas that were floating around in that age. ' The real source of Hebrew monotheism,' says W. L. Wardle, ' we should probably find in the religious experience of Moses which underlies the tradition of Ex 3.'[8] Here Yahweh sent Moses into Egypt to a people that did not worship God by this name, to announce that He had chosen Israel and would redeem them from their bondage. When the people came out of Egypt they repaired to the sacred mount, where the covenant bond was established between Israel and God. This covenant was the pledge of loyalty given by Israel in response to the deliverance already achieved. This was quite different from the bond between Chemosh and Moab, and it is this which distinguishes Mosaic religion from ordinary henotheism. It is commonly believed that Yahweh was the God of the Kenites before He was the God of Israel.[9] This does not mean, however, that Moses simply mediated Kenite religion to Israel.[10] For the bond that existed between the Kenites and Yahweh was similar to the bond that existed between Chemosh and Moab. Here, however, Yahweh claimed for Himself a people not His own and claimed them by the service He rendered to them. The bond between Him and them was a covenant bond which He would never break, but which they might break ; and if they broke it, it would be broken and they would no longer be His people.[11]

In all this, as has been said, there are the seeds of monotheism. The God, or gods, hitherto worshipped by the Israelite tribes were identified with Yahweh, and ceased to count as against Him. There was no conflict between Yahweh and them. He just gathered them into Himself, and in so far as they had characteristics different from His, they ceased to have meaning for Moses. The name of Israel's God henceforth was Yahweh ; but His character was not derived from her own or from Kenite traditions so much as from the redeeming acts which brought blessing to her. Moreover, Israel's religion was established on a covenant basis, and the covenant itself rested on the ethical emotion of gratitude for the achieved deliverance. It is not, therefore, to be surprised at that an

[1] Cf. J. N. Schofield, *The Religious Background of the Bible* [1944], 78 : '[Even the claim that this man, " learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians " (Acts vii. 22), was the founder of a moral monotheism is easily intelligible when we remember the monotheism of Akhenhaten.'

[2] *The Archæology of Palestine and the Bible* [1932], 163.

[3] S. A. B. Mercer (*Journal of the Society for Oriental Research*, x. [1926], 14 ff.) denies that he was a monotheist. Cf. R. Pettazzoni, *loc. cit.*, 197 f.

[4] Cf. Meek, *Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxi. [1942], 36 f. : ' Monotheism to be monotheism must transcend national limitations ; it must be supernatural and universal.'

[5] Cf. A. Causse, *Les prophètes d'Israël et les religions de l'Orient* [1913], 280 f.

[6] A. Lods (*Revue d'histoire et de philosophie religieuse*, xiv. [1934], 197 ff.) denies that Israelite monotheism was derived from any foreign source.

[7] Cf. W. L. Wardle, *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, N.F. ii. [1925], 209 : ' Such " latent monotheism " as we find in Egypt or Babylon is quite different from Old Testament monotheism.' Cf. the present writer's *Missionary Message of the Old Testament* [1945], 20.

[8] *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft*, N.F. ii. [1925], 198.

[9] Cf. the writer's *From Joseph to Joshua* [1950], 149 ff.

[10] Cf. *The Re-discovery of the Old Testament* [1946], 84 ff. (American ed., pp. 119 ff.).

[11] Cf. the writer's *Biblical Doctrine of Election* [1950], 46 ff.

ethical quality was given to that religion from the time of Moses.[1]

Here it is important to distinguish the syncretism of this process from ordinary syncretism, and particularly from the syncretism that identified Yahweh and Baal. There was always an undercurrent of feeling that Yahweh was not Baal, and in any time of national revival this found expression. Yahweh never gathered Baal into Himself, and refused to be swallowed up by Baal. Yet we never find any conflict between Yahweh and the God, or gods, of the patriarchs.[2] They were negligible, *save in so far as they were identified with Yahweh.* All other gods, worshipped by other peoples, were entirely negligible. The gods of Egypt figure in the story of the deliverance, but Yahweh's conflict is not with them, and they could be dropped from the story without varying its course.[3] This is not monotheism, and there is no reason to attribute universalism to Moses. Yet here we surely have the seeds of both. It is not that Yahweh is merely supreme amongst the gods, their monarch and lord, to whom they are subordinate. It is that all other gods are negligible beside Him or against Him. Moreover, Yahweh's power was not limited to a particular land. He could be active in Egypt or in Palestine as freely as in His chosen seat.[4] A God, who could thus be active wherever He wished, who could claim for Himself whatever people He wished, and beside whom no other gods counted, was no tribal or national god, and certainly not merely one of a host of gods. His 'onliness' might not be affirmed; but His uniqueness is manifest. If He is not the only God, He is certainly more than one example—even the most important example—of the category of gods. Amongst all the gods He alone mattered, and He could do with Israel or with any other people what He would.

This is not monotheism, and it is unwise to exaggerate it into monotheism. Nevertheless it was incipient monotheism and incipient universalism, so that when full monotheism was achieved in Israel it came not by natural evolution out of something fundamentally different, but by the development of its own particular character.[5] In substance, therefore, this view is much closer to the view of Albright than to the evolutionary view with which we began, though it refrains from ascribing full monotheism to Moses. The development that followed was a development of the seed which already lay in Mosaic religion, and which came into it from the experience of Moses and the events that arose out of that experience, and not from any *Zeitgeist* or upsurge of the human spirit. Moreover, when development came, it came through the personalities of the prophets, who can hardly be regarded as the expressions of the Israelite life of their day. With Elijah and the eighth and seventh century prophets we find incipient monotheism giving place increasingly to a more specific belief, and in Deutero-Isaiah we find explicit formulation with undeniable clarity.[6] The antiquity of monotheism in Israel may be dated from the time of Moses, therefore, provided it is recognized that it was but the germ of monotheism in his day, when a new impulse of incalculable significance to the world came into religion.[7]

[1] Cf. *The Re-discovery of the Old Testament*, 85 ff. (American ed., 119 ff.).

[2] Cf. *The Biblical Doctrine of Election*, 61.

[3] Cf. *The Missionary Message of the Old Testament*, 21 ff.

[4] For the difference between this and the thought of Sennacherib, cf. *The Biblical Doctrine of Election*, 60.

[5] Cf. F. James, *Personalities of the Old Testament* [1939], 32: 'What he [*i.e.*, Moses] gave Israel was a practical monotheism, out of which the later theoretical monotheism of a Second Isaiah naturally grew.'

[6] Cf. *The Re-discovery of the Old Testament*, 90 ff. (American ed., 127 ff.).

[7] E. Sjöberg's article, 'De förexiliska profeternas förkunnelse,' in *Svensk exegetisk årsbok*, xiv. [1949] 7–42, esp. 8 ff., arrived after this article was completed. His positions agree substantially with those taken in this article.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

This I Know.

By the Reverend Charles M. Hepburn, B.D., Crieff.

'We speak that we do know. . . .'—Jn 3[11].

One night, when it was dark, and perhaps because he was afraid to be seen coming by day, a Jewish scholar, named Nicodemus, came to see Jesus. Jesus told him some wonderful things. Nicodemus was so astonished he asked with a doubt in his voice 'How can these things be?' Whereupon, to convince him, Jesus said 'We speak that we do know.' Or, as you and I might say in a more modern way, 'I'm telling you what I know.'

Some one allowed me to read recently the little life-story of an Edinburgh Academy schoolboy who, when but fifteen years of age, was fatally injured at football. Every one loved him, for he was such a bright and likeable boy. Gordon was his Christian name. Once, when not much more than three years old, he was staying at his grand-

father's house. Gordon's grandfather was a minister. Indeed, he was what is called in Scotland 'The Moderator,' the distinguished minister whom his fellow-ministers choose to preside over the affairs of the Church for a period of twelve months. After attending the church one Sunday morning and seeing his grandfather in the pulpit, Gordon decided to conduct a service of his own in the afternoon, at which the other members of the family were present. As a pulpit Gordon turned round a chair and stood up on it and, putting on a travelling rug as a gown, started off. The hymn he chose was 'Jesus loves me.' The prayer naturally was 'The Lord's Prayer.' The collection wasn't as big as he hoped, but that was solved by sending the plate round twice. Then came the sermon. Gordon hadn't quite bargained for that, but he was too game to turn back. So, looking round upon his listeners, and rather serious for once, he said simply, 'I am going to tell you what I know about Jesus. Some of you perhaps know more about Jesus than I do, but I am going to tell you what I know about Jesus. Jesus healed sick people. Jesus helped blind people to see and deaf people to hear. Jesus was very kind to little children. That is all I know about Jesus.'

It was a first-rate sermon, wasn't it? It was besides quite a lot for a little boy of three to 'know about Jesus.'

Now, of course, that is why you come to church and Sunday school, that you may be taught to 'know about Jesus.' Some of you will know more than Gordon did, and others, it may be, not so much; but one thing you all do know, for you have it in that hymn Gordon chose, the first one nearly all children learn:

> Jesus loves me! this I know,
> For the Bible tells me so.

Only I wonder whether, as well as knowing, you ever try to tell any one else what you 'know about Jesus.' A Scottish mother, who hoped her boy might one day become a minister, said, when she was dying, that the first thing she wanted him to do was to 'speak a good word for Jesus.' Now you can't all be ministers, but please try, whenever and wherever you can, to 'speak a good word for Jesus,' and to pass on to others something of what you 'know' about Him.

The Flightless Bird.

By the Reverend D. T. Davies, M.A., B.D.,
Forest Hill, London.

'And I . . . went and hid thy talent in the earth.'—Mt 25^{25}.

Most girls and boys are bird lovers. It is such great fun to feed them on a tray near the house or on the lawn during the cold of winter—a good turn for which they richly reward us in song at the coming of spring and summer time.

To-day the grown-ups have taken to the task of studying the birds at work and play. There are people whose hobby it is to watch the time and place when and where the migrants, such as the warblers, the swallows, the cuckoo and others, arrive here after their winter's holiday in North Africa. We have now bird sanctuaries in many parts of the land where birds are guarded from danger of their enemies during nesting-time; and there is a Society which boasts of the proud title of 'Royal,' for the protection of wild birds.

The rarest bird in the world is called the 'Takahe,' a native of New Zealand and a kind of cousin to our English bird the 'coot.' For a long time it was thought that this bird had gone clean off the map; not one had been seen since 1898. This had been chased and killed by a dog and was afterwards bought by the Government of New Zealand for £250 for their museum at Dunedin. That was over fifty years ago. You can just imagine the thrill we all felt when the other day three living specimens were found by Dr. Orbell, the leader of an expedition into the wilds of New Zealand. These were not killed but photographed, measured, weighed and then set free to increase their kind.

Now, the curious thing about this rare bird is, that, although it has strong wings, it has lost the power to use them. The 'Takahe' is a flightless bird. In the place of its abode there are no snakes or foxes or any beasts of prey which are likely to attack it. Life being easy and carefree why bother to fly into the blue of heaven for safety! By neglecting to make use of its wings it has lost the power of flight.

God has given us the gift of our bodies. The more we exercise them the better we become in health and strength. Cricket, tennis, hikes and rambles in the open, fresh air are all means to train the body that it may tingle with physical fitness. Our eyes are given for us to use them to see the world of beauty, ears to hear the best music, brains to think and thus grow in knowledge from more to more. Above all, hearts and wills to love and serve our Lord and Saviour.

Jesus once told a story of a man who called to his office three members of his staff; to the first he gave five talents or gifts, to the second two talents, and to the third one talent. He bade them make use of them that they might gain more. Two of them took him at his word and made good by increasing their talents a double fold, thus gaining the 'Well done' of their master. The third, however, hid his talent in the ground, which is to say that he was too careless to use what had

been given to him, with the result that, like the flightless bird, he lost at the last that which he had at the first.

'Take ye away therefore the talent from him, and give it unto him that hath the ten talents.'

A General Prayer.

O God whose Spirit moved upon the face of the waters,
who givest the breath of life to Thy creatures,
lead our thoughts to Thee in this hour.
As light to them that wait for the morning,
as good news from a far country,
let Thy word come to us this day.

O God of mercy and of truth,
we acknowledge before Thee and one another
our ill nature and our ill doing,
we would not have the proud or careless manner
to walk unabashed into Thy presence.
May ours be the contrite heart,
the godly sorrow that worketh repentance.
For our trust is not that our sins are small,
but that Thy forgiveness is great and free
in Jesus Christ.
Lord, extend to us Thy mercy,
and help us to live henceforward as we ought.
May the power of Christ,
who stilled the tempest on the lake,
subdue the storms of passion in our souls.
Let the word of Jesus,
who healed many that were possessed of devils,
set us free from the mastery
of hatred and envy and evil desires.
Cause us who labour for meat that perisheth
also to hunger and thirst after righteousness.
Cleanse us from our faults of spirit and temper.
Take away the hardness of our heart,
our pride and harshness,
our love of violence,
our willingness to walk in dishonourable ways.
Keep us sincere in our purpose,
straightforward in our action,
and kindly in our words and ways.
Kindle within us new fires
of faith and hope and charity.
Grant us, O God, the continual inspiration
of Thy Holy Spirit,
that we may be obedient to Thee,
and good companions to one another,
brave in duty, patient in trial,
bearing one another's burdens,
and so fulfilling the law of Christ.
Teach us also to desire that better country,
to look for the city God hath prepared.
And now, and in the end, let Thy mercy, O Lord,
be upon us
as we hope in Thee, through Jesus Christ our Lord.
AMEN.

The Christian Year.

TWELFTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

The Consecration of Friendship.

BY THE REVEREND T. TUDOR RHYS, B.A., B.D., HINCKLEY.

'My friend, come up higher.'—Lk 14^{10} (Weymouth).

'I don't think I'll buy anything to-day,' said the fussy customer, 'I'm so sorry to have troubled you. The fact is, I was just looking for a friend.' 'Oh, that's all right, Madame,' said the polite assistant, 'no trouble at all. In fact, if you think that your friend might possibly be inside one of these few remaining boxes, I'll open them up, too.'

Friendship, as that little parable might suggest, is often too lightly treated. There is much in the finding and keeping of friends that is casual, arbitrary and accidental. A smile, and the deed is done. Montaigne attempted to answer the question how friendships are formed. 'If you press me to tell why I love him,' he says of his friend La Boétie, 'all I can say is that it is because he is he, and I am I.' Then, why not leave well alone? Why is there any need that friendship should be consecrated?

Friendship, for one thing, is very fragile. A word, and it is wounded. The want of a word, and it withers. And friendship is like fire; unless it is fed and tended it flickers and goes out.

Besides, if friendship is not consecrated, it may turn out to be a curse. 'I am ready to believe in almost any individual,' says John Palmer in *Hesperides*, 'but I profoundly distrust even two individuals when they get together.' 'When three men hold together,' said Swinburne, 'the kingdoms are less by three.' There was a member of the Early Church whose influence was evil. His name was Hymenæus. And he is never mentioned alone but always with somebody else—'Hymenæus and Alexander' or 'Hymenæus and Philetus.' One wonders how much damage he did to his companions. An unconsecrated friendship is not safe; it may even be a peril. How, then, can friendship be consecrated?

1. *The Foundation of Friendship is the Sharing of a Task.* No friendship is safe that goes no deeper than mutual liking. It needs to be consecrated by striking its roots into a common task and by being made to feed from a common faith. There was the friendship between David and Jonathan, rooted in a devotion to the needs of the Kingdom. There were Abelard and Heloise, with their common interest in the poets of Greece and Rome till 'Love made himself of the party with them.' There were W. E. Henley and R. L. Stevenson with their passion for the world of drama

and romance. There were Katherine Conway and Bruce Glasier with their mutual love rooted in devotion to the cause of the common people.

We read that Jesus chose Twelve 'that they should be with him.' What for? To share His task, and that He might share theirs—the task of world redemption. 'Ye are my friends, if ye do whatsoever I command you.'

Friendship between the churches to-day needs to be consecrated by the joining in a task which is felt to be bigger than all the differences. And friendship between the nations needs the consecration of a vision that far outshines all national interests.

The test of friendship, however, is to share a friend, and that is why Jesus came and made friends with us mortal men. 'All things that I have heard of my Father I have made known unto you.' The consecration of friendship needs the Incarnation.

2. *The Condition of Friendship is the Forgiving of Faults.* Friendship is fragile. A chance word can shatter it.

> 'Twas a bubble born of breath,
> Neither sneer nor vaunt,
> Nor reproach nor taunt,
> See a word, how it severeth!

And the pity of it is that friendship seems to be so much at the mercy of the sin which none of us is willing to acknowledge—'the sin that is never shared with any boon companion or whispered to any priest.' How subtly our love for our friends is tinged with vanity is seen from the cynic's aphorism: 'We always love those who admire us, but not always those whom we admire.' It is not the faults that we find that injure friendship but the faults that we keep and treasure up. There is a curious verse in Jude which refers to Michael the archangel contending with the devil and disputing about the body of Moses. The reference is to a story in the 'Assumption of Moses' which says that the devil raked up an indiscretion in the past life of Moses and brought it up against him and used it as an excuse to retain possession of his body. Many a friendship has been wrecked by the exercise of a similar spirit. The purest friendships need to be reconsecrated by the blotting out of the past. 'Friendship cannot exist,' said William Blake, 'without the forgiveness of sins continually.' The consecration of friendship needs the Atonement.

3. *The Crown of Friendship is the Transformation of Troubles.* Our friendship with others is not consecrated by ignoring their faults but by transforming their troubles. A friend is one who takes me as I am, faults and all, and changes me into what I ought to be. One remembers Tennyson's debt to Arthur Hallam:

> But he was rich where I was poor,
> And he supplied my want the more.

A consecrated friendship brings out the best in the friend, not by criticism but by encouragement. A young woman had a friend whose appearance suffered because of a pronounced stoop. Yet she took him as he was, stoop and all. She did not scold him or taunt him but just waited her time. One day she found him making an effort to hold himself straight. At once she complimented him on his fine figure. She only had to do this three or four times to achieve a lasting transformation.

One thinks of Jesus and Simon, the 'man of straw.' Jesus did not scold His friend or tease him or taunt him but simply said to him: 'Thou art Peter,' and under that call of encouragement His friend became what he had been called, 'a man of rock.' A friend is one who encourages us up to our possibilities and transforms our troubles into opportunities. The consecration of friendship needs the power of His redeeeming grace.

4. *The Inspiration of Friendship is the Stimulus of Surprises.* 'He's always the same, he never changes!' A doubtful compliment to pay a friend—soothing, but tame. In all friendships there is an element that stimulates by surprise. When Dr. Johnson was out of sorts, he said: 'If I were to see 'Mond [Edmund] Burke now, it would kill me. That fellow calls forth all my powers.' And there are books that act like those stimulating friends. 'Emerson,' says Marcel Proust, 'scarcely ever began to write without first reading a few pages of Plato, nor is Dante the only poet whom Virgil piloted to the gates of Paradise.'

And what a Friend they had in Jesus, those men and women of the New Testament! Under the inspiration of His friendship they were continually living under the stimulus of surprise. 'And as they followed, they were afraid.' That is one way of putting it. One recalls that time, typical of so many others, when, expert fishermen as they were, He advised His friends to try an unexpected move at an unusual time—'Cast the net on the right side.'

Will death put an end to this wonderful friendship with its inspiration of continual surprise? Or—will the surprises continue on the other side? The consecration of this friendship will need the Resurrection. There will be, some say, a final surprise. In the days of His flesh He used to send out His friends on their common task like lambs in the midst of wolves. And history seems to be repeating the experience. John, the Seer of Patmos, however, caught a vision of the end, and he saw that it was the Lamb who was in the midst of the

throne! That will be a surprise to some—that the final victory belongs, not to the wolves, but to the Lamb!

But even that, we believe, will not be the final surprise, for this Friend's victories are only opportunities for further effort and holier aims. And the biggest surprise of all will be to hear Him whisper to the lowly in heart: 'My friend, come up higher.'

THIRTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Spiritual Insight.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man.'—1 Co 2^{15}.

Suppose you were to hear some one refer to you as a spiritually minded man or as a man of spiritual insight, how would you feel? Most people would take it as a doubtful compliment; and the reason is not far to seek. They have an idea of spirituality as something narrow, disdainful of life in all its interest and variety, perhaps even weak or effeminate. What a mistake! Our text gives the true idea of spirituality, and it is at first sight a surprising one. 'But he that is spiritual judgeth all things, yet he himself is judged of no man.' The word translated 'judgeth' is used nine times in this letter of St. Paul's and in no other; hence it has been suggested that the conceited Corinthians were wont to use it as the catchword of an intellectual coterie—like the words 'criticism' or 'culture' in modern times—and that the apostle took it over from them for purposes of his argument. It means to test, examine, inquire into, so that one might paraphrase the first clause of the text thus—'he that is spiritual has a critical appreciation of all things.' In Paul's view the man of spiritual insight is alive to life in its full range and on all its levels. He can take a complete and not uncritical survey, for he is the true all-round man. One may be sure that only the Lord Jesus Christ, the God-Man, answers this description fully, so let us keep the perfect manhood of the Gospel portraits before us as we go on to explore the implications of this truth.

1. The man of spiritual insight is alive to levels of human experience to which others are dead. 'I am all right so long as I have beer and a bed,' said a prisoner to a London magistrate. Compare that statement with this from Traherne, the mystic: 'Your enjoyment of the world is never right till every morning you awake in heaven, see yourself in your Father's palace, and look upon the skies, the earth and the air as celestial joys.' The first man, alive only to the world of the senses, was dead to so much to which the other was gloriously alive. No doubt that is an extreme case, but extreme cases may bring the point home to us more forcibly. Take another extreme case. The chief impression that one receives from certain wards of a lunatic asylum is that, while all the inmates are talking, they are talking to themselves and not to one another. They are introverted; they are dead to fellowship. Similarly, some men are dead to intangible principles. It was said of a brilliant politician of not far distant days that the note of his political life was an easy flippancy. As the graces of youth vanished 'his bankruptcy of the deeper wisdom of affairs and of the disinterested attachment to a considered philosophy of government' became more apparent. That was a man alive to the senses and very much alive to the intellect, but dead to intangible values. In the same way some are dead towards God. They have 'lost the Face that made existence home.'

The man of spiritual insight, however, is alive to all these levels of experience, even the highest. Jesus could spend all night in prayer as well as join in a tax-gatherer's feast. The spiritual man is the all-round man. It is as narrow to scorn a sacrament as to despise a soirée: it is as narrow to shun a prayer-meeting as to have no use for a race-meeting.

2. The man of spiritual insight appreciates even the lower levels of human experience more than others. The sensual man cannot reach up to the spiritual level, but the spiritual man can enjoy the life of the senses; yes, he can not only enjoy the lower levels of experience, but he can enjoy them more than the man whose whole interest is in them alone. A friend of Temple Gairdner of Cairo, the missionary to the Muslims, writes thus of being with him once in a summer garden—'He took my arm and said, "Let's watch the garden praising God!" and then he began to chant in his strong, virile voice, "O ye delphiniums, bless ye the Lord—O ye azaleas, bless ye the Lord," and so on, right round the garden borders. Who but Temple Gairdner could have done it, and made his companion feel that it was the most natural and fitting thing in the world—and feel it with a thrill of inspiration?'

One can imagine Jesus doing that, He who delighted in the lilies of the field and in human fellowship, children, friends and the common meal. Surely it may be said of the man of spiritual insight that all things are his. He gets more than other folks do even out of the lower levels of human experience.

3. The man of spiritual insight from his vantage point can appreciate things critically. The sensual man is in a fog, the spiritual man enjoys the clear air of the heights. The latter, therefore, can discriminate and follow a plain path among the

relative values of things. He alone sees things in proper perspective, sees life steadily and sees it whole. That is why he sometimes hears the call to forsake the lower for the sake of the higher. He knows that such sacrifices are worth-while.

Think of Jesus again. He enjoyed Nature and human nature and family affection, but He put all that behind Him and accepted an early death, seeking first the Kingdom of God. The spiritual man can grade the values of life. His appreciation is not uncritical.

4. The man of spiritual insight is not open to the critical appreciation of others. Open to their criticism he certainly is, and he gets it in full measure; but it is criticism without knowledge. The spiritual man is the all-round man; others are partial and only half-developed. Hence they cannot make him out. They are like deaf people seeing a normal person entranced by the music of an orchestral concert. Their criticism is as prejudiced and ill-founded, for they cannot understand what it is that rivets the attention and causes the thrill. The spiritual man stands, as it were, on a height overlooking the world, independent of the praise or blame of lesser folks, himself overlooked by God and answerable to Him alone.

So it was with our Lord in the days of His flesh. He seemed eccentric; His disciples misunderstood Him; His family thought Him deranged. You remember how Matthew Arnold in his sonnet to Shakespeare says:

Others abide our question. Thou art free.
We ask and ask—Thou smilest and art still,
Out-topping knowledge.

. . . . .

And thou, who didst the stars and sunbeams know,
Self-school'd, self-scann'd, self-honour'd, self-secure,
Didst tread on earth unguess'd at.

Much of that might be said of our Lord. Note, especially, the term 'self-scann'd.' That, in a word, is St. Paul's phrase about the spiritual man, 'yet he himself is judged of no man.' He is not open to the critical appreciation of others. He is self-scanned.

In conclusion, let us note that this is the ideal of the man of spiritual insight. True of perfect Man alone, it is true of others only so far as they are filled from His fullness. That means not only that we must think of spirituality in terms of Him, it means also that we must receive it through Him. Spiritual insight, as St. Paul makes clear in the context, is not a natural endowment; it is something that the natural man—and that means all of us—must receive. We are not alive to the higher levels of experience till we are born from above, born of water and the Spirit: we are not all-round men till we have received the gift of the Holy Spirit. So the beginning of the way for us in this matter of spiritual insight is just the beginning of the whole Christian way—the surrender of faith to a Crucified and Ever-living and Exalted Saviour.

FOURTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Harvest Thanksgiving.

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE JOHNSTONE JEFFREY, D.D., GLASGOW.

'They joy before thee according to the joy in harvest.'—Is 9^3.

Nature has many sights to warm the heart of man, but none more beautiful than the golden sheaves, as they lie, row on row, in the autumn sunshine. Here, once more, is 'God's plenty' for man's perennial and utter dependence. Here, too, is displayed for the feeling heart and the thinking mind the miracle of the seemingly dead seed, in the dark earth, coming by familiar stages to wondrous fruition—a miracle, and not less so because it happens every year we live, Of the seed, as of the stars, Emerson's words ring true, that if this thing took place only once in a thousand years, how mankind would gasp and stare! And yet, to the credit of the human heart be it spoken, the merest worldling is moved to rapture by this annual pageant, and the most blasé amongst us feels that, if he did not join with his fellows in the song of harvest-home, the very stones would speak. 'They joy before thee according to the joy in harvest.'

Here, to begin with, is *the rich joy of co-operation.* Only a farmer or your true garden-lover, who knows 'the thrill of growing things,' can enter whole-heartedly into this Divine-human partnership. How willing a man is to do all a man can do, all that a man is expected to do, when he knows that all the while he can count on supernatural power to crown and reward his unceasing toil. The perfect expression of this co-operation is found in one of the gems of Christ's parables, though its lustre has been somewhat dimmed by the more familiar Parable of the Sower. In this brief, simple story Christ pictures a man happily and expectantly casting the seed into the ground, and having tended it, going unconcernedly about his other duties and at night lying down to quiet sleep, sure that great supernatural forces have now taken the seed out of his keeping and will in due time bring it to abundant fruition. For the seed groweth up 'he knoweth not how.'

Is not this co-operation one of the purest joys, as it is one of the most amazing adventures, of Christian living? Which of us but feels, every day we live, the germination within us of seeds

implanted in our hearts by the Holy Spirit of God? What are these intuitions, flashes of insight, promptings, leadings, 'stops' and impulsions which it is to be the glory of the day to tend and obey? God plants a happiness or success in our lives and it lies with ourselves if it is to prove a curse or a blessing. He takes a sorrow that lurks in the secret place of the heart and by the working of His supernatural grace it bears fruit, not in bitterness or in envy of others but in a chastened and understanding sympathy. He sets a complete stranger in our path and this man lives to be the vital influence in our career. We pick up, 'by chance,' one book, leaving others unread, and it sets our lives ablaze with the impulse to great and creative living. Some sour disappointment comes our way but we are made to learn that 'God has provided some better thing for us.' What a harvest the most untoward and repugnant experiences can, under God, be made to yield!

Haroun, at sunset, in life's garden saith
Within this pleasaunce, many a plant there grows
Of flower or weed, until it slowly comes
To budding time, none but the Gardener knows.

How could I know the ugly, twisted root
Of pain He gave me in the darkest hour
Would burgeon with the tender leaves of hope
Would bloom with joy's most lovely, crimson flower?

When we learn believingly, patiently, obediently the secret of working with God, we are on the way to the highest kind of harvest thanksgiving.

Again, harvest joy comes of building our lives on eternal foundations, *on the everlasting laws of cause and effect.* 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' There are two aspects of this law—one austere, the other beneficent. Have we the courage and the realism to be on God's side when He relates our wrong-doing to its sure nemesis in suffering? God has set plainly before us certain awesome deterrents to evil. We are surely lost to every consideration of honour and chivalry if we blind ourselves to the fact that our moral failure will work its direst consequences in the hearts dearest to us and that our cowardice will go speeding into other lives in pulsations of unmerited pain. Let us tell ourselves once for all that the fruits of our sin can never be confined to ourselves. If a man sins he does so, not as an isolated individual but as a father, a husband, an employer, an elder, a minister, a friend—a thought surely to bar the way to evil like an angel with a flaming sword. Conversely, what an incentive to good is here! If we conquer, all who love us best—wives, friends, children—will garner precious spoils in their hearts. 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' Why should these words read like a threat? Why should they not shine for us like a golden promise? Every time a man goes into the private place with God, cleansing his motives and giving his heart to the Purifier, thereafter every thought and word and deed of his will acquire a Divine lustre and glory. 'Whatsoever a man soweth, that shall he also reap.' This law is a 'savour of death unto death' to those who flaunt it. But it has a savour of life unto life to those who live by it. And in the life, which is life indeed, life abundant, life eternal, they will one day joy before God according to the joy in harvest.

Lastly, it were good to remind ourselves that *there is a spiritual joy for which the material harvest has no analogy.* The harvest of the fields has its own definite season. You can predict the time 'to put in the sickle' to within a few days. But such prognostications are difficult to make regarding the harvest of the spirit. 'God does not pay on a Saturday, but He pays.' There is much comfort here for troubled hearts. The harvest is often deferred and we grow tired and faint by the way. But it comes, and that often in the most mysterious ways. One day Lord Macaulay received a cheque for twenty thousand pounds. But that, he said, was a harvest day, the reward of years of unremitting toil. We too, have these harvest days. When a former pupil revisits his school, with the rich promise of human usefulness gleaming in his eyes—on that day his teacher reaps his harvest and knows that his toil has not been in vain. A Christian minister has many a day and many an experience when he feels he is but ploughing the sand. But let him revisit the scenes of his former labours and in welcoming faces and the grasp of kindly hands he learns that if God does not pay on a Saturday still He pays. A father is often troubled regarding the influence his own life has had on lives he cherishes with unutterable love, but the day comes when he rejoices to see his son or daughter seeking instinctively the clean, white things of life, and this is his true harvest-home.

And there is a corollary to this thought. If God can wait to see His precious seed coming to fruition so can man. Our best harvests may be reaped long after we have gone. Can we be faithful

In the deed that no man knoweth
Where no praiseful trumpet bloweth
Where he may not reap that soweth?

There never was a time when such sowing was so much needed as to-day. We live in a world sick with the pangs of hope deferred. Just when some helpful plan for the healing of mankind seems to be laid on stable foundations it crashes, and chaos is come again. But through one frustration after another we must fare forth into the future believing

that the very hardness of our epoch is its glory, that our darkest hour may be our finest, and that God has yet something lasting and precious to bring to birth out of all this travail. The harvest may be reaped not in our day, or in our children's, but in our children's children's. If we sow in self-effacement, with 'the end far out of sight,' we may yet reap a harvest greater than we know, living worthy of the heroes of the faith of whom it stands written: 'These all died in faith, not having received the promises. . . . God having provided some better thing for us, that they without us should not be made perfect.' And life shall lose its sense of futility and frustration and the dirge shall become a song:

We are living, we are dwelling
In a grand and awful time,
In an age on ages telling.
To be living is sublime.

FIFTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Rest in Weariness.

BY THE REVEREND JAMES MUNN, M.A., DUNDEE.

'Fret not thyself. . . . Rest in the Lord.'—Ps $37^{1.\ 7}$.

If we are to judge by the lavish advertisements of our popular magazines, food and drink and clothes are a perennial attraction for the average reader. That warning might well have been spoken to the man in the street and his wife who are about to fall for these alluring offers of foods, wines, and slim modern clothes—'Take no thought saying, What shall we eat? or, What shall we drink? or, Wherewithal shall we be clothed?'

Much of the remaining space for advertisements seems to be claimed by medicines. Headache powders, evening drinks for sound sleep, pills for vitality and health—it looks as if half the world were waiting for stimulants to overcome weariness of body or of mind and to cure the droop in their spirits! What is it that wears us out, that leaves us sub-standard and makes us tired? And can religion handle our need for rest and restoration?

Never are we so tired as when we are tired of ourselves. 'You can stand a lot if you can stand yourself,' runs our pithy saying; but sometimes you are the last person you can stand. That cry of the Psalmist has never become a mere echo from the past, 'Oh, that I had wings like a dove! for then would I fly away, and be at rest.' But that is no solution to the problem, for you can't leave yourself behind. Elijah tried. He broke away from Carmel after his single-handed success against all the priests of Baal; the thrill of that spectacular triumph had drained the last drop of his stamina. 'Let me out of this publicity,' he seemed to mutter, 'away from the clash of men and the smell of blood. Let me drop the whole business. I'm pulling out.' And so he headed for the desert and the deepest cave he could find, pulled his cloak over his head and went to sleep. Any of us can panic like that if we too become nervy and shaken and played out.

Perhaps we do not quite go so far as that. We are disappointed in ourselves and worried. We can muster only an ounce of ability to balance a ton of obligation. Or we have put everything we had into some cause and have seen no sign of advance. Or we have wrestled against a secret temptation, but, like an invisible millstone, it hangs round our neck and we never win free.

At which the Apostle Paul breaks in on our moody reflection. 'I too have felt the whip of unfulfilled intentions. I wanted to multiply my contribution to the Church and the Kingdom of Christ over and over again, and I was tripped and crippled by my physical disability. I pledged my honour to Christ; I fought for mastery; and yet again and again I was flung back shamed and impotent.'

And what did you do, Paul? How did you break through into abundant power? What steadied you and gave you reserves close at hand?

Paul replies: 'I did not do something more for God; I let God do something more for me. I stood still and let the winds of God blow through my life; I stopped complaining, stopped even promising, and let Him fill the silence of my mind with His comfort. I relaxed the tension of my muscles in order that the tides of grace might ebb and flow through my heart at His will. And He said, My grace is sufficient for thee: for my strength is made perfect in weakness.'

Dr. John Hutton has a sermon of excellent wisdom 'On Accepting Ourselves.' There can be no peace for us, he declares, so long as we thraw against the limitations life decrees for us. But we have grace to accept *ourselves* when first we have sense and faith to accept *God.*

Or we may be wearied by the unsolved mysteries of life. A black impenetrable darkness can loom up over our whole horizon till hope and faith are blotted out and courage is sapped clean away. We are not sure if the game is worth the candle! We are not sure if it is worth while fighting on or trying again! We are not sure if there is any one to care!

A young man or a young woman is struck down in the glory of life's opening strength, and it is more than we can understand or bear. Life loads us with one misfortune after another, and why? what for? A man who had kept the authentic gleam of faith in his soul was so distracted and tortured that he flamed out—'I will say unto God

my rock, Why hast thou forgotten me? why go I mourning because of the oppression of the enemy? As with a sword in my bones, mine enemies reproach me; while they say daily unto me, Where is thy God?' And always Calvary's Cross stands starkly against the skyline of history, and the cry sobs through all the generations, 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?'

Surely it is not fair! How can we be expected to love honour, justice, purity, kindness, if all we get in return is the silence of an inscrutable Creator and bitter heaps of broken hopes! This sort of weariness seeps right down to the lowest crannies of our living; and who shall deliver us from the body of this death?

But the doom of destruction need not fall flatly on our spirit, even in this mood of dereliction. Let a man rest himself in the positive certainties of God and no longer will he lie at the mercy of thick darkness. An aged member of our congregation once spoke to me of a well-remembered sermon by her old much-loved minister. 'Yon was a sermon you could lean against.' If that tribute can be offered for a contemporary word, how much more is it true for words that have been tested by the generations. 'Underneath are the everlasting arms.' 'The Lord is my shepherd.' 'He hath said, I will never leave thee, nor forsake thee.' You can lean against words like these!

Affirm passionately again and again the categorical certainties of God. Resign what is beyond *your* understanding to the understanding of God, what is beyond *your* strength to the unfailing strength of God. The responsibility for the ultimate shape of things has passed over from you to Him. The battle is no longer your puny striving matched against heavy odds. The battle is with the Lord of Hosts. God is our refuge and strength. O rest in the Lord.

Sometimes we wear ourselves out most of all by resisting God. The materialistic philosophers invite us to believe that this universe is 'nothing more than a mud pie made in the dark by two blind children, Matter and Force.' A strangely naïve simplification of our extraordinarily complicated existence! It is a judgment which you can accept only if you agree to write off mother-love, pity, heroism, a sense of beauty, and a thousand other intangible realities.

If you venture so far as to allow the fact of a Creator, surely you must conclude that He has acted according to definite conceptions and intentions, that He has created the universe to run on certain lines. If life conforms to the basic design of the Creator, it will move forward with something of harmony and achievement. If we keep living against the grain of the universe, then we grow fretted and frustrated and utterly spent.

The truth is that the pressures of God are constantly brought to bear on us, and the only secret of rest is Obedience. Saul of Tarsus, the brilliant, impetuous, ruthless critic and tormentor of the Christians, knew what the Vision meant outside Damascus, when he heard One say, 'Saul, Saul, . . . it is hard for thee to kick against the pricks.' One incident after another, one experience after another, had been planted alongside his way, as if to hedge him in to one discovery and one direction. And life was intolerable until he should give in. Jeremiah plainly told God that He had deceived him and therefore he was no longer prepared to serve; the message given to him had been laughed at, and he would not, and could not, go on. He writes: 'Then said I, I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name. But his word was in mine heart as a burning fire shut up in my bones, and I was weary with forbearing, and I could not stay.' Only 'in his will is our peace.'

Do you sometimes get a feeling of profound restlessness, as if you were not fitting in and the machinery of your life were jarring and grinding? Then the pressure of God, the pursuit of God, is very near to you.

> Nigh and nigh draws the chase,
> With unperturbèd pace,
> Deliberate speed, majestic instancy;
> And past those noisèd Feet
> A voice comes yet more fleet—
> 'Lo! naught contents thee, who content'st not Me.'

Contentment, rest, peace of heart—all these are yours through joyous obedience to God.

SIXTEENTH SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Divine Light.

BY THE REVEREND A. D. HARCUS, M.A., D.D., LONDON.

'For God, who commanded the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.'—2 Co 4[6].

How often has Scripture used the message of Nature to make clear a spiritual truth but never more directly than in this verse. Natural light and all that man owes to it leads on to the thought of spiritual light and what that means to the soul of man. What is our experience of natural light, what does it mean to us? And as we dwell on these qualities the spiritual message will be revealed.

1. *It illumines*, making darkness light. Every new day provokes a sense of wonder, out of the darkness of the night into the glory and freshness of a new day. Can we think of Christ leading us

out of darkness into His own most glorious light? The thought is difficult to grasp. The light of the gospel has been shed abroad for many generations, in a sense we never knew the darkness. How well He has kept His word—that 'he that followeth me shall not walk in darkness, but shall have the light of life.' There are so many declarations and promises of this kind in Scripture. It is a truth that is asserted again and again, now in simple direct language, 'I am the light of the world'; now in beautiful poetic imagery, 'The dayspring from on high hath visited us, to give light to them that sit in darkness and to the shadow of death, to guide our feet into the way of peace.' And it has come true, the promise has been generously fulfilled. Amid the uncertainties of life, the doubts, the despairs, to have the pathway illumined, to see it shining before us more and more until the perfect day, that is the gift of God who 'hath shined in our heart, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ.'

It creates. However destitute we may be of scientific knowledge we know the sun to be the source of energy. Grim pictures are painted of a dead world in ages to come when the sun has lost its power. What sunshine means can be realized in a comparison of the arctic circle in winter and the glory of a garden in June. The creative power of light is shown by the ripening harvests in the fields, by the amazing colours of even the wayside flowers. The human heart as a garden, how often the illustration has been used; and the thoughts that can abound there are likened unto flowers in the summer. 'The fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace. . . .' Of the creative power of Christ in the lives of men and women let history tell. And this is true not only of the greater personalities, those who have made history, like Wycliffe, Luther, Wesley, Livingstone, and a host of others, but it is also just as true of ordinary folk, known to ourselves, whose witness and friendship have enriched us beyond measure. The light of the knowledge of the glory of God shined in their hearts with creative power multiplying the spiritual resources of the world just as the sunshine brings the harvest to fruition to supply men's bodily needs. 'And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. . . . And God said, Let there be light: and there was light.' And out of that gift sprang the world as we know it to-day, the world of life, of movement, of colour, of creative activity. And 'the people that walked in darkness have seen a great light,' the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ. And out of that gift will spring the world of our hopes and dreams, the world of goodness, truth, and beauty, brought into being by the creative power of Christ in the hearts of those who trust and obey Him.

It redeems. This third power was not known when the text was written, the healing quality of light was then undreamt of. Perhaps the general truth was acknowledged, that sunshine brought health and strength but the qualities and virtues of the different rays were undiscovered. Now we know or are beginning to know something of these powers. They are both negative and positive. Negative in the destroying of that which is harmful and deadly, positive in building up new life and energy. How accurately the illustration fits. He has the power to search out and destroy the evil deep-seated within us.

> Thy kind but searching glance can scan
> The very wounds that shame would hide.

And His redemptive power, the power to cleanse and heal has been experienced by multitudes who praise His name to-day. And like the action of light, the working of His grace remains a mystery. Accustomed as we are to the marvels of modern healing, the effect of the light-rays has something of the miraculous in it. It is unseen, the light not different seemingly from an ordinary light, and yet what a startling change it can effect. The influence of Christ upon the soul of the believer, who can tell how it works, but the effects are miraculous. He cleanses and heals just as literally as He did in the days of Galilee.

In the face of Jesus Christ. Here is a dramatic contrast! The glory of God, and all that that phrase meant to the Jewish mind, the wonder of the universe as it is revealing itself to the modern man, these immensities are focused on the personality of Christ. Here is the meaning of life, the revelation of God's purpose. Even the word 'personality' tends to hide the simplicity of it all. As if St. Paul had tried to find the easiest word, free from doctrinal complications, the word to bring us right into the presence of Jesus Himself, to see His face. So the multitudes saw Him, not understanding who He was, but just knowing His grace and power. So little children can see Him to-day as they hear the stories of Jesus. So through the ages amid all the varieties of theological emphases men and women have seen Him in the gospel story, almost one might say the very changes of His countenance, from anger to pity, from sorrow to joy. And seeing His face has been for them like seeing the sun on a summer day, the shining into their hearts of the light of the knowledge of the glory of God.

> That one Face, far from vanish, rather grows,
> Or decomposes but to recompose,
> Become my universe that feels and knows.

Gambling—A Problem for Christian Ethics.

By the Reverend W. Lillie, D.D., Dulnain Bridge, Grantown-on-Spey.

The memoranda submitted by the representatives of the various churches to the Royal Commission on Betting, Lotteries, and Gaming indicate differences of opinion in the various churches. 'While some hold strongly the view that gambling is wrong in itself, others would not base the discussion on that particular judgment.'[1] There is general agreement that gambling under certain conditions and in certain forms has ill effects both on the characters of those engaged in it, and on the social and economic life of the country. 'The Church of England has never declared officially that gambling is wrong in itself,' although 'the Anglican Bishops, at the Lambeth Conference of 1948, have made their own views quite clear, for Resolution 44 . . . draws attention to the grave moral and social evils that have arisen in many lands through the prevalence of gambling on a vast scale.'[2] The Roman Catholic memorandum quotes 'a well-known Catholic moralist,' Father Davies, to the effect that 'betting is a luxury, but not in itself sinful,' and the memorandum goes on to say, 'Gambling though not in itself wrong may be wrong for certain persons. . . . In other words it may be the cause or occasion of wrong-doing.'[3] The Church of Scotland General Assembly makes a strong if not altogether unambiguous statement. 'Gambling in all its forms is contrary to the mind and spirit of Christ. It is sub-Christian, non-moral and anti-social, an evil in itself and evil in its consequences.'[4] There is a similar suggestion in many of the churches' statements that gambling is something unworthy of a Christian, but not a violation of the moral law; the Assembly resolution quoted uses the phrase 'non-moral' not 'immoral.' Gambling is regarded by the Committee of the Churches for Evidence and Action as contrary to such Christian principles as 'the stewardship of money' and 'the dignity of man,' but one looks in vain generally for a statement that it is contrary to the Natural Law. The consequence would be a recognition of one ethic for Christians and another for unbelievers in this matter. Only two statements by the churches appear quite explicit in stating that gambling is wrong in itself. The Methodist Church Conference states that 'gambling disregards both moral law and neighbourly regard,'[5] and the Salvation Army Guide to Membership states that 'gambling is, in essence, a form of dishonesty, since it consists of trying to obtain from another something for which no return is given.'[6] What is even more perplexing in these statements than the lack of agreement as to the wrongness of gambling is the lack of cogent argument on the part of those who hold gambling to be in itself morally wrong. Too often in the past the arguments of such people are patently rationalizations, arguments framed later in order to support views held on emotional or other grounds. It is only too likely that, in the condensed arguments which follow, I am doing the same without realizing it.

[1] Minutes of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Betting, Lotteries, and Gaming, Ninth Day.

[2] Geoffrey Martin, *Gambling and the Citizen*, 74, 75, 80.

[3] Minutes of Evidence taken before the Royal Commission on Betting, etc., Sixteenth Day.

[4] *Ib.*, Ninth Day.

[5] *Ib.*, Ninth Day.

[6] *Ib.*

I.

Elementary students of ethics are familiar with the views that an action may be wrong in itself (the deontological view), or that an action may be wrong because of its consequences (the teleological view). It is convenient in Christian ethics to separate the consequences affecting society generally and the consequences to the character of the agent in the action. Common opinion holds that a habit like gambling may be wrong in all three ways. (*a*) It may be wrong because of its ill effects on other people. No one doubts that drinking or gambling which leads a man to deprive his wife and children of the necessities of life is morally wrong. (*b*) It may be wrong because of its ill effects on the character of the person who has the habit. The excessive drinking which reduces a man to a continually besotted condition and causes a general degeneration in his talk and behaviour will everywhere be considered to be wrong. (*c*) An action, and consequently a habit, may be wrong in itself apart from any of its consequences. We can imagine a case where a man, who murders a person of evil character and influence is doing an action with apparently good consequences to society at large and possibly no evil effects on his own character, and yet many moralists would hold his action to be wrong, for they consider that for one individual to kill another is wrong in its very nature. We shall consider gambling in the light of these three standards in turn in the remaining sections of this article.

If this were a study in general ethical theory, it might be suggested that the consequences of an

action on society generally or on the character of its agent are what Richard Hooker calls ' signs and tokens which, being always annexed with goodness, argue that where they are to be found there also goodness is,' [1] and that the essential goodness or badness of an action is in the action itself. To defend such a view would require an ethical treatise, and, for our present purposes, if certain consequences are universally or even generally present as ' signs and tokens,' their presence can be used at least to corroborate an opinion of the goodness or badness of a habit like gambling.

II.

A difference between deontological and teleological theories of ethics, which has not been commonly noticed, is that, if we take consequences into account, the extent to which an action is practised will make a difference to its badness or goodness. Deontologically minded moralists sometimes argue that if an action is right or ethically neutral on a small scale, it is always right or neutral, however widely it is practised, and this is the end of the matter. It would seem obvious, however, that, if we take the consequences of an action into account, the moderate drinking of a limited number of people might have no evil consequences on society, while the drinking of a large number of people might have very evil consequences indeed, such as, for example, an increase of road accidents. It is similarly a possibility that gambling on a small scale may have little or no evil consequence, but that gambling on the scale on which it is practised in Britain to-day may have very evil consequences on our society. We need not consider here the case of the gambler who gambles away all his pay so that his wife and children starve. The wrong, indeed, is not altogether in the gambling here ; he would be doing the same kind of wrong if he were to spend all his pay on tobacco or drink. The evil consequences are not nearly so clear, and probably not so great when a man buys a shilling ticket in a raffle or sweepstake or makes a regular weekly investment in the football pools. Such a petty gambler does not seem to be doing anybody harm, and may have even deliberately decided that he gets more pleasure from his weekly flutter than he does from a packet of cigarettes. Yet there is some evidence to-day that, when millions of people do this, an injury is being done to the whole economic structure of society. Is it right that, at a time when all the available man-power of the country is needed for the production of food or exports, hundreds of thousands of people should be engaged in the organization of football pools ? The pool business is said to be the seventh biggest industry in Britain. Each gambling individual is doing his part to perpetuate this unhappy economic condition. There is some evidence that there are sometimes more evil consequences. A leading Scottish lawyer and a city banker independently gave me their opinions that gambling, and not intemperance, is now the greatest social evil in Britain. Both had the same story of the time wasted and the lack of interest in their work on the part of those whose minds seemed to be absorbed in the chances of horse races or football matches ; and occasionally worse followed. There is the little sum taken from the shop-till to meet the weekly obligation, the larger sum taken when the smaller sum is not missed, and finally, in an occasional case, disgrace and tragedy. It may be thought that the consequences are at any rate good in the case of those who gain money, but even this is doubtful. Mr. Geoffrey Martin tells how, of sixteen people who have won large sums from football pools, only two have laid out their capital intelligently ; ' several have wished that they had never won it : they simply did not know how to cope with the situation and found the worry and responsibility altogether too much for them.' [2] This view is amply confirmed by a similar investigation conducted by *The Picture Post*, a paper with a strictly neutral attitude to gambling.

It is fair to add that it is doubtful whether the consequences of gambling can be measured in such a way as to make a balance between its gain and losses—both financial and moral. It may be that the millions of people who get a little pleasurable excitement from their weekly gamble enjoy an accumulation of pleasure which outweighs the unhappy and even tragic consequences of gambling in a few cases.

III.

Does gambling do harm to the characters of those who engage in it ? St. Paul, if he be the writer of 1 Timothy, maintains that ' the love of money is the root of all evil.' Now the original motive to gamble seems to be as often the love of excitement as the love of money ; it is the ' little flutter ' that the gambler enjoys. There can be little doubt, however, that gambling stimulates and fosters the love of money and that, as the habit grows, the petty gambler becomes more and more concerned with the winning of money. The gambler may reply that he is not the only sinner in the matter of loving money ; most of us share, to some extent in this sin ; but the gambler does differ from other people in doing something that constantly excites and encourages this evil

[1] R. Hooker, *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*, bk. I. ch. 8 (ii.).

[2] *Op. cit.*, 68.

tendency of our nature. For the Christian our Lord's word is final, 'Ye cannot serve God and mammon'; and it is no accident that, as the craze for gambling has expanded, the desire to share in the public worship of God has become less in our country.

Ruskin, in *The Crown of Wild Olive*, has several arguments against betting, based on the ill effects of the habit on the gambler's character. One of these is that 'you concentrate your interest upon a matter of chance, instead of upon a subject of true knowledge.'[1] A Christian might express the same point by saying that a gambler relies upon chance instead of relying upon Providence. Although many people may see nothing very wrong in such an outlook, the thoughtful will recognize it to be one instance of Plato's 'lie in the soul'—a fundamentally false outlook on life, which is far more damaging to the soul of its owner than many wrong actions. It is the loss of reliance on God's providence that makes so many people willing to let their affairs be governed by chance. Gambling may indeed be defined as 'an agreement to determine the possession of value or money *by* chance.'

Ruskin goes on to say, 'You back opinions which you have no grounds for forming, merely because they are your own. All the insolence of egotism is in this.'[2] The egotism of the gambler may not be a conspicuous evil, but once again it points to a false outlook on the universe, an outlook where the fact that an opinion is your own matters more than the fact that it is true.

IV.

These things may be only 'signs and tokens' of moral evil. What is fundamentally wrong with gambling is that it is contrary to the Law of Nature, which Christians hold to be the Law of God. One principle of this Law is the principle of the *just price*. 'There is a price which it is reasonable and right to charge, and to take more, however willing purchasers may be to pay, is avarice.'[3] This applies to services given by human beings as well as to goods; a man should have a fair return for his labour. This aspect of the principle of the just price has been a source of much social reform and is emphasized in popular thought to-day. In the name of God and God's law men have demanded that the working man should get a fair return for the work he has done and that his labour should not be exploited. This is God's justice, proclaimed by Old Testament prophets, and by St. James, when he said, 'Behold, the hire of the labourers who have reaped down your fields, which is of you kept back by fraud, crieth: and the cries of them which have reaped are entered into the ears of the Lord of sabaoth.'[4] There is, however, another aspect of this Law of Nature, not so commonly recognized, that a man should not get something for nothing. St. Paul expressed it to the Thessalonians in pointed language, that 'if any would not work, neither should he eat.'[5] Gambling is in its very nature getting something for nothing or getting something very large for something very small. There are cases in a fallen world where one principle of the Law of Nature may be modified by another. In the case of inheritance, it may be that the principle of the just price is under present conditions modified by the principle of parental duty, although here, too, I consider the receiving of large sums of money, without the recognition of an obligation to duty or service, to be bad and productive of evil consequences. I am unable to think of any other principle of the Law of Nature which might modify the principle of the just price in the case of gambling. Our earlier sections have suggested that the habit of gambling is injurious both to the individual human soul and to the national economy. The reason that it is injurious in both cases is that it is contrary to one of the fundamental principles on which this world and the life of man have been created by God.

[1] P. 162. [2] *Op. cit.*, 162.

[3] W. Temple, *Christianity and Social Order*, 31.

[4] Ja 5^{4}. [5] 2 Th 3^{10}.

Contributions and Comments.

Was His Father Lying Dead at Home?

A Question of Exegesis.

'YES, that's what I used to think—before I went to India.'

A young man and I had just heard a sermon by a minister in Ohio, prominent in his denomination. In speaking of the supreme claim of the Lord Jesus on us and ours, he had cited the instance of the disciple whom Jesus called to follow Him and so urgent was the call that the Lord would not give him permission to go and perform the last rites for his father, who lay dead at home. 'Yes,' I said, 'I used to think that that man's father lay dead at home and I wondered why the son should not bury his father before following the Lord Jesus. Now, however, what I have learned in India has given me an entirely different view of the passage, and I see that the father was not lying dead at home.'

When we examine what the commentators have written on Mt $8^{21f.}$ and Lk $9^{59f.}$, we shall find

various interpretations given in the attempt to make plain what Bruce calls a 'mystic, hard saying.' Even Edersheim understands the account to mean that the father lay dead at home. 'We feel morally certain,' he says, 'that, when Christ called this disciple to follow Him, He was fully aware that at that very moment his father lay dead.'

This was the view I held, but it did not seem satisfactory to me. One Sabbath in Kodoli, India, I was teaching the men's class and this passage in Luke was the lesson. I asked an illiterate farmer (a Christian man from the outcastes) what request this man made of the Lord Jesus when Jesus called him to discipleship. He replied (in Marathi), 'Let me go home and bury the old man first.' As I heard those words the meaning of the passage flashed through my mind. The use of the term 'old man' made it all clear. This term does not carry with it the contempt sometimes expressed in English by the use of those words; it is used of the father when he has grown too old to work and support himself and must be supported by the children. Similarly, 'old woman' is used of the aged mother. That this term, which to us seems rather harsh or impolite, may be a term of endearment can be seen from an incident related to me by our senior missionary. When asking the names of the children in a certain home he learnt that one boy was called 'Old Woman.' 'What?' said the missionary to the father, 'how can that be? That isn't a boy's name.' 'No,' admitted the father, 'it isn't; but my old woman (aged mother) was so dear to us that we named our boy after her.' The aged mother was called old woman, but with not the slightest disrespect.

The expression 'to bury the old man' as used in Marathi means to take care of the aged father after he is no longer able to earn his own living, till he dies and then to bury him. This may be illustrated by the use of the expression in a conversation I heard between two men in a train. They were Anglo-Indians and Anglo-Indians often take over into English the idioms of the vernacular. One of these men was telling about his home in Bangalore, where he lived with his wife and her aged father. The other man asked him, 'Why don't you move away from Bangalore to such and such a place?' He replied, 'That's what we plan to do, but my wife says, "Let's bury the old man first and then move."' Clearly the meaning was that they should take care of him till he died and they buried him, and after that they would be free to move elsewhere.

So, here, the young man asks the Lord Jesus, 'Give me permission to go home and take care of my old father till he dies and I bury him; then I'll come and follow Thee.' This, of course, might involve many years and was tantamount to an indefinite postponement of the call to discipleship.

Judging from the custom in India, a man in Palestine whose father was lying dead at home would certainly not be spending his time listening to some Teacher presenting His Message; for his whole attention and time would be given to the one duty of arranging for the funeral of his father. Indeed, so urgent is this in India, that among many people in the towns and villages there is the strict rule that as long as a corpse is in a house no family of that same caste may light a fire or have a meal. This has the advantage of inducing all the members of a caste to help those who are mourning their dead to dispose of the corpse at once. Cremation or burial follows almost immediately upon death.

After reading the above interpretation, Mr. S. D. Jessup of Sidon, Syria, wrote me as follows: 'I showed your letter to two of our missionaries who are most scholarly in such matters and both agreed in general with your interpretation. I showed your letter to two members of the Syrian Synod who know English. One said that he quite agreed with you, though he had never given the matter especial thought; the other seemed surprised and said that no other interpretation had ever occurred to him, nor would any other occur to a Syrian who knew the custom of the country.'

With this understanding of the request made to the Lord Jesus, His reply is to be explained as follows: 'Leave the spiritually dead to bury their own physically dead; that is, Leave the spiritually dead to care for thy aged father till his death and burial; they can do that work; but thou hast been called to other service, go thou and publish abroad the Kingdom of God.'

H. G. Howard.

Urun-Islampur, India.

Entre Nous.

Preaching.

To deliver and to publish a series of Warrack Lectures may well be included among the more dangerous of ecclesiastical occupations. For one thing such a series must challenge comparison with those series which went before and which bear the names of A. J. Gossip, James Black, J. S. Stewart, A. W. Burnet, and many another prince of preachers. For another thing, it inevitably provokes the

question, How has this man succeeded in carrying his own theories into practice? And for still another thing, it is in the last analysis to attempt to teach the unteachable. But let it be said that in *The Ministry of the Word* (Nelson; 6s. net), wherein we have the substance of the Warrack Lectures of 1949, the Rev. R. E. M'Intyre, D.D., emerges triumphantly from every test.

First and foremost, in the best sense of the word this is a practical book. Dr. M'Intyre writes: 'In preparing these Lectures I have had in mind chiefly the needs of those who will be serving Christ as ministers of a parish charge; that has been my experience, and my aim is to share with you such lessons as experience has taught me.' Further, Dr. M'Intyre speaks with the voice of authority. This book is as peppered with imperatives as the Epistle of James.

Very finely Dr. M'Intyre defines preaching thus: 'Preaching is the proclamation of divine truth with a view to conviction.' Of the choice of texts he says, 'You will choose that which best enables you to proclaim the glory of God in Christ and bring His grace home upon His people's needy hearts.'

One of the most attractive features of this book is that it has a pleasant pugnaciousness. Dr. M'Intyre has no patience with the man who criticizes the Bible with a penknife. 'Shakespeare did not write his *King Lear* simply that we might study his use of the semi-colon!' 'That the Early Church invented a Gospel and then fabricated a Christ to justify it, I declined to believe; first, because the Early Church, Paul included, could not have done it; and second, because the residual Jesus left by Form Criticism could not have created a Church to invent His Gospel for Him.' 'I would rather master a few supreme classics than keep pace with the leaders of thought as they pass into oblivion.' 'The scientific layman is ready to pour scorn upon theological word-jugglers who teach a doctrine of eternal punishment, and then explain that punishment does not quite mean punishment, and eternal does not mean for ever and ever. But he does not cry "Shame!" when the physicist defines Ultimate Reality as Mind-Stuff, though "by Mind I do not exactly mean mind, and by Stuff do not at all mean stuff."' Dr. M'Intyre tells of a minister who made the not uncommon claim or confession, 'I am an evangelist, thank God, not a theologian,' and says that it is roughly the equivalent of a doctor saying, 'I know nothing about scientific medicine, but am, thank God, a pure quack.'

There is a really magnificent chapter on 'The Use of the Old Testament.' There, indeed, the riches of the Old Testament are expounded. Dr. M'Intyre has a very helpful answer to those who would declare that he is finding meanings in the Old Testament which are not there. 'Gilbert Murray has declared it to be the very essence of a great book that it has fresh meanings for every age. He then goes on to say, "The author was not conscious of all those meanings; your interpretation of him was fanciful; you are reading into him ideas of other times; you find in him more than was intended." This is the very evidence that the book has life. It has latent correspondences with human nature, which time alone discloses.' But Dr. M'Intyre is treading on dangerous ground when he says, 'An interpretation may be evangelically sound even though it is based on a doubtful exegesis, just as Drinkwater's play *Abraham Lincoln* is "wrong in all its details, yet right in its essential message."'

Dr. M'Intyre quotes a fine story of St. Bernard. One of his monks had not faith enough to believe in the Real Presence but had faith enough to believe that he would be damned for disbelieving. Bernard burst out, 'What! A monk of mine go down to hell? God forbid!' But then to the poor doubter he did not say, 'Away with thee, lost wretch!' He said, 'Go and take the Holy Communion with *my* faith.'

WILLIAM BARCLAY.

Rūmī.

Once, long ago, a distinguished man, who was very kind to me, turned upon me in print because I had ventured on a short quotation from Rūmī, demanding angrily, 'And who *is* Rūmī anyway?' He was a great scholar; but he ought to have known something about 'the greatest mystical poet of Persia.' For many, Rūmī's works are an avenue leading well into the heart of Sūfiism; and so to some real understanding of mysticism as a whole. Hitherto, though old friends like Whinfield were ever at hand, Rūmī has been somewhat inaccessible to ordinary people. But he is so no longer. Before his death that expert on these matters, Professor Reynold A. Nicholson, had prepared a 'book of translations illustrating Sūfī doctrine and experience as depicted' by Jalalu 'Din Rūmī. And here it comes—*Rūmī*: Poet and Mystic (1207–1273) (Allen and Unwin; 8s. 6d. net)—only a selection, it is true, but with the easy skill of the real master. It is highly to be commended. For Rūmī is a most interesting thinker, with something that appeals to many minds.

A. J. GOSSIP.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.